(8)

Scientia inflati charitas ædificat. Robt Jones ff. 4:2

AN ANSVVER

to *Mr. Tombes* his Scepticall Exercitation of Infants Baptisme:

Wherein Baptisme is declared to ingraft us into Christ, before any preparation: and the Covenant of the Gospell to Abraham and the Gentiles is prooved to be the same, extended to the Gentiles children, aswell as to Abrahams:

Together with the Reason, why Baptize Children, is not so plainly set downe in the Gospell, as Circumcize Children, in the Law, and yet the Gospell more plaine then the Law.

Whereunto is now added, A Provocation of Mr. *Tombes* to make good his generall charge, against Mr. *William Hussey's* Satisfaction to his Scepticall Exercitation.

By *William Hussey*, Minister of the Gospell, at *Chesilhurst* in *Kent*.

He is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions, and strifes of words, whereof commeth envie, strife, raylings, evill surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth. 1. Tim. 6. 4. 5.

LONDON,

Printed for *John Saywell*, and are to be sold at his shop, at the signe of the Starre in Little Britaine. 1647.

82 (8)

BIBLIOTHECA BODL

TO THE READER.

Courteous Reader,

I Having read and ſeen the Labours of divers learned men that have undertaken the handling of this point; and ſeeing that this Doctrine of Anabaptiſts doth much ſpread, notwithſtanding all the induſtry that hath been uſed by men of ſingular parts and piety; I did wonder that ſuch a growing evill ſhould ſpread and prevail with men that did pretend ſo much to piety, and finding that they cryed up the authority of the Scripture, as if men that did plead for baptiſme of children, had nothing to countenance their doctrine, but humane authority, and ſet up mens inventions, contrary to the Scriptures; when I ſaw that theſe Anabaptiſts did ſo earneſtly plead for the authority of Scriptures, and declare themſelves ſo devoted to the rule of Gods Word, I had compaſſion on the affections of theſe men, willingly granting that that was indeed the rule we ought all to be guided by, I did as unpartially ſift, how truly and faithfully they had dealt in the applying themſelves to this ſacred rule: I perceived, that they did rather ſteal away the hearts of men with the ſhew only of pretended reſpect unto the Scriptures, then that they did with diſingaged ſpirits ſearch into the ſenſe and meaning of the Holy Ghoſt, as men deſirous to be lead by the authority of God. I heard men cry up Scripture, Scripture, nothing would prevail with them but Scripture. I reſolved to concurre with them in this, that the Scripture and only Scripture ought to be our rule, in theſe ſupernaturall things of Gods worſhip: and if I could have found that they had argued rightly out of Scripture, I ſhould have moſt willingly joyned with them; but examining the ſincerity of their dealing herein, I ſaw them carried on with a ſpirit of pride, imagi-

ning, that because children had been baptized, and that those men which had maintained childrens baptisme, had maintained other errors, therefore in the disaffection that they bear unto former times, they were resolved to wrap up baptisme of children among other things, and throw out it also, together with those things that were indeed spurious and humane, out of the worship of God: they could not endure mans inventions in Gods worship, and therein their zeal was good, if their knowledge had been answerable: but here I saw much pride, vailed under the cloak of piety, mencarrying on their opinions with opposition and clamour of multitudes, rather then with sobriety and diligent enquiry into the state of the question: But whilest I saw this humour, wandering in the lower region of the unlearned, I did not so much wonder, though I were much moved for their sakes, because their souls were as pretious to me as other mens, yet when I heard that it soared aloft among the learned, I thought it then high time to bestir myself, to search into the ground and reason, why they also with others might be deceived in that point: wherein I took some pains to search into the cause, and have for the publike good given some small account thereof: and here I will turn sceptique with Mr. Tombes, and examine whether our books have stated up the question of Anabaptists high enough, and have sufficiently cleared those Scriptures that are cited in the controversies. For my part, I conceive, that the main reason that hath so much prevailed with the multitude, is, because the ceremony of circumcision being put down, and that being required of the Iews; so as that every circumstance of time, qualification of the person is expresse, he must be a male in the family of some believer: and no such plainnesse is used in the matter of the Sacrament of baptisme; for want whereof, ignorant persons have proclaimed the baptisme of Infants will-worship, because it is not said in plain terms, ye shall baptize children; this may be an excuse to men at first sight and consideration, but upon new enquiry; let it be considered, whether the different manner of the phrase between the Gospel and the Law, hath not put the difference. The service of the Law was in shadows and types; therefore the externall rite was plain: they had not any ground at all from reason, no, not grounded upon the Word for the use of them: the authority of God did fall upon the rite it self immediatly, without any other explication, but that it was the confirmation and

seal

ſeal of the Covenant made with Abraham and his ſeed, whereby they were made partakers of the bleſſing in Chriſt, the ſeed of Abraham: Now, the Goſpel doth declare the promiſe to Abraham more plainly, and our ingrafting into Chriſt by baptiſme more diſtinctly, according to the nature of the ſacrament; and in a more rationall way, entitling us to the promiſe, requiring the Miniſters of the Goſpel to baptize all nations, males and females: without any limitation of yeers or ſex, whereby the proffer of grace is made to all nations: the ſeal of this proffer is baptiſme, whereby we are ingrafted into Chriſt, the promiſed ſeed; the promiſe of the Goſpel is plainly declared to be the promiſe made to Abraham, enlarged not in it ſelf, but by vertue of more ample diſpenſation: the promiſe to Abraham was not only to Abraham and his ſeed, but to all nations of the earth, though by providence before Chriſt, kept within the nation of the Iewes. The ignorance, or not attendance on this different manner of adminiſtration have cauſed men ſo rigorouſly to require ſuch expreſſe direction in point of adminiſtration of the ſacrament of baptiſme; and by this means brought themſelves into ſuch difficulty, that if they ſhould ſtand to their principles, they could not finde out any way to adminiſter the ſacrament of baptiſme at all, unto any perſon whatſoever, for want of more plaine and particular direction: And thus, while they go about to inſiſt upon the Letter, and require the regulation of the Ordinance of Chriſt, to their own fancy, they make the Goſpel more obſcure then the Law, contrary to the conſtant declaration of the Goſpel which proclaimeth it more plain and full, more diſtinct and cleer, then the cloudy, weak, and childiſh manifeſtations of the Law: The Law ſaith circumciſe a childe at eight dayes old in the family of Abraham, or any other believer; baptize all nations, ſaith the Goſpel: circumciſe males, ſaith the Law; males and females ſaith the Goſpel: circumciſe, this is my Covenant, ſaith the Law moſt obſcurely; baptize into Chriſt, by whom we have acceſſe by faith into grace, Rom. 5. 2. moſt plainly ſaith the Goſpel: The Law giveth the ceremony therein moſt obſcurely, wrapping up the promiſe of Chriſt; the Goſpel promiſeth Chriſt moſt plainly, and moſt rationally drawing after it the ſacrament of baptiſme; children are in Chriſt by election of grace, before they are born; this is plainly ſet down in the Goſpel, but obſcurely intimated in the Law. Now, ſacramentally men

are

are ingrafted into Christ by baptisme, but personally to judge men faithfull, and thereby in Christ, before they were ingrafted into him, were a contradiction in adjecto; therefore are men appointed to baptize and preach the Word, as being able to administer externalls only. The second delusion is, in that they interpret the histories of the Acts of the Apostles, wherein historically is related that persons baptized did believe, not that confession, or profession of faith was made to the Apostles; and that the persons baptized had their faith approved by the Apostles; and that that was the ground upon which they baptized them, which is a plain addition to the Scripture: But my earnest request to Mr. Tombes, *and all other Anabaptists, is, to look on the doctrine of the Gospel, in a more spirituall way, then to subject it to such a grosse and carnall apprehension, and finde out some means in a more satisfactory way to state the premise of the Gospel according to the Word of God, then heretofore.*

Yours in the Lord,

William Hussey.

July 1. 1646.

I *Have perused this Answer to* Mr. Tombes *his Book against Pedobaptisme, or baptizing of children; and finding it to be, in my judgement, solid and judicious I do allow it to be printed and published.*

Iohn Downame.

SATISFACTION TO Mr. *Tombes* his ſceptical Exercitation Concerning Infants-Baptiſme.

THe Method that I ſhall take in the handling this Controverſie ſhall be, firſt, to ſtate the Doctrine of Baptiſme, as it was delivered by Chriſt, and underſtood by the Apoſtles, as may appear by their practice; then anſwer the ſophiſmes and fallcies of Anabaptiſts, and in particular, of Mr. *Tombs*; and laſtly, ſome arguments to prove the lawfulneſſe of childrens baptiſme: As for the baptiſme of *John*, it was of God; God ſent him to baptize, but as the Miniſtry, ſo the Baptiſme of *John* was perſonall, began and ended in him; he was not a Miniſter of the Goſpel, he was the greateſt of the Prophets, but the leaſt in the kingdome of Heaven is greater then he; he was *prevarſor*, the forerunner of Chriſt, of whoſe baptiſme the Scripture is ſo ſilent, (if you conſider the form and nature of it) that we may quickly affirm more of it then we can be able to prove: As for Chriſt making Diſciples, and his Diſciples baptizing, the Scripture likewiſe ſpeaketh little, only that Chriſt made Diſciples, and his Diſciples baptized them: during the time of Chriſts abode upon earth, he did all things well, but ſome things he did which he was not pleaſed to reveal to us, what is written, is written for our learning; and ſo much is written, as by believing we may have eternall life.

In things that are liable to no difficultie, a greater liberty of words is uſed: as, *Go preach the Goſpel to every creature*; here men cannot eaſily miſtake, becauſe none are capable of the Goſpel but reaſonable creatures: So in the Commiſſion, Chriſt ſaith, *Make Diſciples of all nations, baptiſing them in the name of the Father Son and holy Ghoſt*. Here Chriſt giveth a Commiſſion to make all nations his ſchollers, baptizing them, and teaching them what he commands: Here our Sa-

viour is plain in the manner and form of Baptisme that was new and unknown: concerning the doctrine they should teach, he telleth them, he will give speciall command what they should teach; and for the subject, that being before limited to Jews, is now extended to the Gentiles also: but what should be the qualification of persons to be baptized is not said, neither doth the Apostles any where declare, or give any thing in charge to *Timothy* or *Titus*, (to whom St. *Paul* wrote, as unto Ministers of the Gospel, to acquaint them with their duty) as matter of any difficulty wherein they might easily fail: and in 1 *Cor.* 1. he by occasion speaking of Baptisme, speaketh of that, as of a thing consisting in form of words, and outward rite of washing, (so as it is ministerially to be performed) wherein no such difficulty was, or danger of mistake; and therefore he had little care thereof, men of meaner qualifications might do that; yet were the Corinthians baptized before he wrote to them, and a Church; In all the dogmaticall parts of Scripture, not one word concerning any direction to the Minister whom he should baptize, whereby it is plain, that Christ did not charge his Disciples with any danger of mistake in baptizing, they should teach what Christ had or should command, for matter of doctrine; and Christ doth referre the commission to future direction; but in all the Scripture no farther explanation concerning the persons that were to be baptized: The Churches were baptized no man knowes by whom. To Churches and Saints, men received into the Church, is all the doctrine of the Apostles directed, whereby it appears, that they had care to teach all that Christ by his Spirit did command; but so little is spoken concerning the persons to be baptized, or the manner of administration, more then is in the commission; that it may plainly appeare, no controversies were raised concerning that: it was a plain case wherein they walked, without dispute; or, it seemeth, suspition of controversie, though light enough be given to the truth; so that Antipedobaptists, without offending against plain Scripture, can have no ground to oppose the baptisme of Infants by those inartificiall and groundlesse arguments which they urge against it; and certainly, it was long ere much was said, and the strength of that which is said, will appear. What is gathered out of the commission, *Go, make Disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, teaching them, &c.* we shall consider:

Nations is the subject, that is so cleer, that Mr. *Tombs* confesseth it, though with this limitation, nations that are made Disciples; which limitation can receive no colour without apparent alteration of the words. First, make them Disciples, and then baptize them, saith Mr. *Tombes*: three words are added, (*first, and, then,*) the words plainly import, make Disciples by baptizing them and teaching. I have added nothing but the word *by*; and that is implied in the participiall expression, as may appeare to all English men that understand their own tongue: as in the like phrase; make, or build houses, laying the foundations on the rock,

rock, and raiſing the walls and roof of laſting and durable matter, do not theſe participles expreſſe the manner of doing? or, may a man gather from hence that the houſe muſt be built before the foundation muſt be laid? Again, the word nations, is a Noune of multitude, and the very commiſſion ſeemeth to point at the nation of the Jewes for the pattern, that they ſhould call other nations into covenant with God even after the ſame manner as the Jews have been, by vertue of the ſame promiſe; and thus it is apparent, the Apoſtles all underſtood it. Paul, both to the Romans, *Rom* 4 11. and *Gal.* 3. 17. doth argue, that the promiſe might ſtand the ſame to us, as was to *Abraham*, though circumciſion be taken away, for as much as the promiſe was before circumciſion, even to *Abraham*; and there might remain the circumciſion of the heart, though the outward circumciſion were taken away, and Baptiſme put in the place of it; and from this promiſe, *Act* 2. 39. S. *Peter* argueth to Baptiſme, *the promiſe belongeth to you*, therefore be baptized. If then Baptiſme may be tendered to nations, nations may receive baptiſme, that is, it may be, nay, it muſt be received by a nationall covenant, the nation of the Jews were only in covenant with God before Chriſt; but all nations after Chriſt hath broken down the partition wall. Now principally a nationall covenant doth conſiſt in this, that the moſt principall of the nation do covenant for the reſt, the more conſiderable part do receive for the reſt, and require performance of others their inferiours. God laid circumciſion upon the Jews under a penalty, which is a nationall way of receiving; God commandeth all to be circumciſed by a Law, under a penalty, that perſon that was not circumciſed, muſt be cut off, *Gen.* 17. 14. that the whole nation might be circumciſed. If any ſhall object, that the Jews were all to be circumcized under a penalty, but the penalty was appointed of God. I anſwer, that was an eſpeciall priviledge of the Jewes, that they had their civill Lawes from God, but what lieth upon a nation as a duty, that it may require of all, and cut off them that refuſe; and this is implied in the commiſſion, when nations ſhall covenant to be Diſciples, which may be done by a part for the whole, then are ſuch as are in commiſſion from Chriſt commanded to baptize and teach the whole nation, ſuch as are in authority may covenant in a nationall way for the inferiour ſort, and juſtly require all externall performances from them, ſuch as Baptiſme, and ſubmiſſion to be taught are; as for faith, and internall performance, no creature can judge of that, or require it of another in a judiciall way.

If any object that the Apoſtles did not execute their commiſſion, but upon ſuch parties as did believe, and would be baptized.

I anſwer, a commiſſion cannot be executed in full extent, untill opportunity be gotten; he that hath a commiſſion to hang up all the thieves in the kingdom, muſt execute it as he may; he muſt hang them as he can catch them: as ſoon as they could procure a nationall willingneſſe, they were ready to baptize them, as

by the many thousands baptized by them the same day of their conversion may appear, taking them in by families, which act by a nationall way, the master of the family covenanting for his servants and children: So *Josh.* 24. 15. *I and my house will serve the Lord*; he may not believe for his servant, but he may covenant for externall worship for his son, under a penalty, and for his servant according to his condition, under penalty, or dismission of service, that the whole family or nation might come in: And that the Gentiles should in such a manner flow into the Church, the Prophets do fully testifie, *Isai.* 2. 2. *All nations shall flow, &c.* See further what light the word Disciple doth give to this sense of the commission. Disciple is a relative, and is referred to master, to him that giveth precepts, which have sanctions of reward, and punishment annexed; and this is the covenant that is between the master and the scholler, that he will teach and punish the negligence of the scholler, the scholler must be under the covenant of submission, or otherwise he can be no scholler.

Now, note that two ways this covenant of a scholler may be put upon any person: First, it may be put on with the consent of the scholler: or, secondly, without, in case of a slave, his Lord may impose what covenants he pleaseth, without his consent, if he will live and enjoy his being, the father may, and that justly, by his interest that he hath over his son by nature, put him to school, and make a scholler of him, even before he be willing to consent; he may justly carry him, and correct him, if he refuse to be put under the power of a Schoolmaster, giving his Schoolmaster power to correct him. Now, to send him to school to Christ, and teach him the precepts of Christ, and this imposed on the parent of Christ, by his Apostles, *Ephes.* 6. 4. *And ye fathers, provoke not your children to wrath: but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.* And what a parent can do over his child in matter of duty, that may the parents of the countrey, the Magistrates, require of the nations. God requireth it of them, they may put all the nation to school to Christ: Now, what if some of them be too young to learn, yet if they be under the discipline of the Master, they are schollers? as may appear in many little children that are set to school, to keep them safe, and from wantonnesse, before they be of capacity to learn, many have a hornbook given, more for a play-game, then a book, yet are they schollers, because under the discipline and correction of the Master; is it not therefore great reason, that a Christian should dedicate his childe to Christ, to be partaker of the blessing and discipline of Christ? surely godlinesse hath the promise of this life, and that which is to come. What, is the Infant capable of no good from Christ? neither in soul nor body? hath Christ nothing to do with him? Christ did blesse sucking Infants, and as he blesseth, cannot he likewise punish at pleasure? Why then, if he hath power over all nations, and *de jure*, they are all under his discipline, may not Christian parents put their children under the tuition of Christ, seeing, though they cannot learn, yet

he

he can bleſſe, and hath right, and will puniſh, which we by baptizing our Infants do but acknowledge? nay, certainly he is an Infidell that doth not think that Chriſt can teach the Infant by his Spirit, though we cannot by means that we can uſe, or that he doth not qualifie the ſouls of the elect Infants, with gifts of grace, not given to reprobates, if they die in infancy, which though he can, and will without baptiſme; yet this is ſufficient incouragement for a Chriſtian parent to put his ſon to ſchool to Chriſt, if Chriſt can teach him, this were a vain thing to think for any ignorant parent to refuſe to put his ſon to ſchool, becauſe he underſtandeth not Latine or Greek himſelf; it is ſufficient that the Maſter underſtandeth and knoweth how to teach. And certainly, words could not have been invented that could have required the Miniſters to baptize all the world, Infants and all, willing or unwilling; ſo that any would ſee they might be taught, and ſubmit to the precepts and diſcipline of Chriſt, then to expreſſe it by the word Nation, and Diſciple; and this was plain to them that underſtood what it was for a nation to be in covenant with God, whereof there was but one pattern at that time, and ſo it doth appear the Apoſtles did underſtand it as a plain thing: in that, though often they took occaſion to ſpeak of baptiſme, yet never did explain this point concerning childrens baptiſme, as thinking it plain enough in the pattern: what might juſtly raiſe a ſcruple concerning the baptizing of women, ſeeing they were not circumciſed, that is, declared in plain terms, both men and women were baptized. Baptiſme is in room of circumciſion, as in anſwering Mr. *Tombs* his arguments, I hope to make appear. For the further underſtanding of this word Diſciple, I ſhall endeavour to ſet forth the full latitude of the word: the formall reaſon of a Diſciple, is *in relatione ad Præceptorem*, the foundation of which relation is a covenant between the Maſter and the ſcholler, whereby the Maſter is ingaged to deliver precepts, and the ſcholler is bound to hear and undergo the penalties of his errors and contempts.

Now, this covenant is either impoſed, as in caſe of a ſlave, when a Lord doth lay any covenants upon his ſlave; here the benefits of the covenant be mercies, the puniſhments, if leſſe then the greateſt, or under any conditions avoidable, are favors; ſo *Naaſh*, 1 *Sam.* 11. 2. tendered a covenant to put out every one of the Iſraelites right eyes, which if he had been able to have deſtroyed, as he conceived he was, had been a favour; in this caſe one party maketh the covenant without mentioning the other but as patient; therefore, *Gen.* 15. 18. God is ſaid to make a covenant with *Abraham*, and 17. 9. God calleth the covenant, his covenant, God made the promiſe and conditions, not *Abraham*; but in *Gen.* 21. 27. there, when *Abraham* and *Abimelech* did covenant, the Text ſaith, *they both made a covenant*; *Abraham* his conditions, and *Abimelech* his.

If the word Diſciple be taken in this ſenſe, then it is no more, but tell all nations, that I am that Prophet that was promiſed by *Moſes*, *Deut.* 18. 18, 19. and

thus Peter Acts 3. and Stephen Acts 7. did make disciples, repeating those words of Moses, A Prophet shall the Lord your God raise to you like unto me, him shall you heare; and he that will not hear the voice of that Prophet shall dye the death; and then these words make disciples, doe signifie no more then tell all Nations that I am sent of my Father to teach them, and they that will not heare shall dye the death. Christ without any more adoe doth give Precepts, and threaten death to all the world that refuse, and so make disciples is no more but tell them they are disciples, and under the Precepts of Christ; but if any acceptance be required of the disciple, the naturall father or father of the Country, may covenant for their children as before.

Secondly, a Disciple may be understood in reference to the end, and that either actively for a man that is active or diligent to get learning, he is said to be a Scholer; or passively a man is said to be a Disciple or Scholer that is learned; and this *inchoativè vel ad certum aut designatum gradum vel perfectivè*: if this man that is to be baptised must be taught *inchoativè*, it will serve turne to have learned one lesson in reference to that one lesson he is learned, though he hath learned but an A the first letter of his Alphabet. In the second sense men are assigned a certaine measure of learning as sufficient for one calling, another measure for another calling; what degree of knowledge men must attaine to before they be baptised, no man yet hath declared: and in so great a silence of Scripture were an arrogancie inexcusable; for want whereof, all that is said concerning a Disciple to bee made before baptised, is without any regularity and certainty; if it bee understood *perfectivè*, then a man must never be baptised, if not before he be made perfectly learned; whereby it appeareth that we cannot be said to be made learned in disposition to Baptisme, but as before made Schollers in relation to Christ our Master by Baptisme in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, being taught the precepts of Christ.

Mr. *Tombes* 127.p. falleth upon this as urged by some obscure person, but saith it is so foolish, that no man will say so but he that is out of his wit, but hee in the meane time answereth it no better then by saying if this were true, the Apostles needed to have done nothing else then to baptise them: I thinke if ever a man were out of his wit, it was here; Christ saith, make Disciples by baptising them and teaching them, if he meane so, need they only baptise them, and not teach them? or if they were made Schollers, must they not be taught when they are schollers? in what sense doth this man take scholler? surely in such a sense that he need be taught no more: if he must be a Disciple in such a sense before he bee baptised, it were a bold adventure for any Minister to baptise any man, or if hee did, the party baptised must be taught no more: if baptising would make Disciples, the Apostles need doe no more, this were a good excuse for not preaching Priests. It is plaine Christ commands to baptise and teach; what if a man do performe

ſome part of his duty, is he diſcharged of the other part? the command is in conjunctive tearms both muſt be performed. But Mr. *Tombes* fell on that obiter, and I have vindicated it for the true ſenſe of the words which he ſo ſcornfully rejected: but I further prove it.

What doe not βαπτίζοντες and διδάσκοντες being active participles, expreſſe the action of their verbes: and is not μαθητεύσατε the end, is not every action to an end? yes certainly, and to make Diſciples is the end, inrolling them by Baptiſme, and after teaching them the meanes. I deſire that men may not be outfaced from principles and rules. But I haſten to try the ſtrength of Mr. *Tombes* his arguments.

He confuteth this practice, that Infants borne of Beleevers are univerſally to be baptiſed; for my part I ſtate not the queſtion ſo, but Infants borne in a Nation that are the Diſciples of Chriſt, or have received the Goſpell, are to bee baptiſed: of Beleevers much more, if preſented by them; and they undertake to inſtruct them by themſelves or others in the precepts of Chriſt.

But let us ſee Mr. *Tombes* his ſophiſmes, That which hath no teſtimonies of Scripture that is doubtfull.

Infants baptiſme hath no teſtimony of Scripture, *ergo* doubtfull.

The *minor* Mr. *Tombes* laboureth to prove by an induction, but it wanteth forme; he ſhould have ſaid, *& ſic de cæteris*, none of all theſe places might prove this, and yet it might have teſtimony from ſome other place: but I will follow him in his exceptions, and ſee how juſt they are againſt the teſtimonies produced.

The firſt teſtimony which he pretendeth accurately to examin, Gen. 17. 7. &c. I paſſe by his jingle, he raiſeth 14 arguments raiſed out of ſeverall places of Scripture as urged in defence of Pædobaptiſme, which he anſwereth, whoſe anſwers I ſhall endeavour to examine, and ſee how the arguments are as he urgeth them, or as they may be urged from this place of Geneſis: to whom the Goſpell Covenant agrees, to them the ſigne of the Goſpell Covenant agrees; but to Infants of Beleevers the Goſpell Covenant agrees, therefore the ſigne of the Goſpell Covenant, and conſequently Baptiſme. That Mr. *Tombes* might prepare for an anſwer, he ſheweth a great deale of his accurate skill, he examines foure *ſuppoſita*, things granted on the part of Pedobaptiſts, and converteth them into queſtions, ſtateth them apart, and ſo endeavoureth to take away the ſtrength of the argument.

1. Whether the Covenant made with Abraham, and the Goſpell Covenant be the ſame? Mr. *Tombes* denieth with this difference, that the Covenant with Abraham was mixed, but (with reſpect to Mr. *Tombes*, his opinion of learning he hath gotten) he beginneth at the worng end to prove it: for a Goſpell Covenant between God and man, taketh in all the Covenants that now are, or ever were

ſince

ſince the fall between God and man: God was never in covenant with any man or Nation, but in Chriſt: Chriſt is the adequate ſubject of the Goſpell: this Goſpell was preached from heaven by the Angels, Luke 2.10. εὐαγγελίζομαι, I preach the Goſpell, which was in theſe words, Unto you is borne this day in the City of David a Saviour which is Chriſt the Lord: Certainly whatſoever the Saints enjoy upon earth, or ſhall enjoy in heaven, they enjoy it in and for Chriſt. Whereas Mr. *Tombes* diſtinguiſheth the promiſes made to *Abraham* into Evangelicall, Domeſticall and Civill promiſes; what had *Abraham* ſome things in Chriſt and ſome things out of Chriſt? godlineſſe hath the promiſes of this life and that which is to come. Now to deny the promiſes of this life to belong to *Abraham* under Evangelicall promiſe, or to diſtinguiſh individualls by ſpecificall difference, is ſtrange Divinity and ſtranger Logick, is reaſon of different nature in *Peter* and *Paul*, or is *Pauls* reaſon of another nature then *Peters*, becauſe he uſeth ſome particular arguments that *Peter* doth not? *Abraham* had the bleſſings of his houſe, and others have the bleſſings of their families: and Gal.3.9. *Paul* telleth us, that they which beleeve are bleſſed with faithfull *Abraham*, they are not bleſſed only as the ſeed of *Abraham*, but as *Abraham* they are fountaines of bleſſing to their ſeed through faith in Chriſt; and that doth that inference cleerly prove that *Abraham* was intituled to the bleſſing by his faith, *tanquam medio*, as by the meanes, and therefore is *faithfull* repeated in the argument with *Abraham*, that thoſe that beleeve are bleſſed not *with Abraham*, but *faithfull Abraham*; and further ſaith, not that the faithfull are bleſſed with the ſeed of *Abraham*, but with *Abraham*, they that beleeve have as full a right to the promiſe as *Abraham* himſelfe: the ſame Covenant, the ſame bleſſing, remaines to us with *Abraham*: as for thoſe particular differences they are but numericall, and make no difference in the promiſe, no more then the difference of *Peter* and *Paul* doe in mankinde: *Abraham* had his family bleſſings, wee have ours: *Logica non tractat aut definit particularia*: if any ſhall ſay that his being father of Chriſt after the fleſh putteth a mixture of the Covenant, and maketh it of another nature: I deny that it doth any more vary the nature of the Covenant, then a badge of honor doth the nature of man, and this ſhall appear in that ſo much of the covenant as was ſealed to *Abraham* by circumciſion commeth down to us; and if *Abraham* had any bleſſing that came not to us, that was not ſealed to him by circumciſion, foraſmuch as all the benefit that *Abraham* and his naturall or faithfull ſeed had of circumciſion, that the Beleever hath without circumciſion. For though it be true that circumciſion was given to all indefinitly, yet the benefit of circumciſion came only to the faithfull both before and after Chriſt came: and this is ſo plainly ſet downe by Saint *Paul*, that nothing can be more plaine, that circumciſion was of force to *Abraham* by faith, Rom.4.9.10. Faith was reckoned to *Abraham* when he was uncircumciſed, and that he received circumciſion

a ſeale of the righteouſneſſe of faith : and in verſe 12. he ſaith, that *Abraham* was father of circumciſion to them that were uncircumciſed; where he implied that thoſe that were uncircumciſed were circumciſed in a ſenſe : and this is farther affirmed of them who are in Chriſt Jeſus by faith, Col. 2. 10. that they are circumciſed with circumciſion made without hands; and this circumciſion with hands is ſpecified, Eph. 2. 11. Yee were uncircumciſed with circumciſion in the fleſh made with hands, implied that they were circumciſed in the heart : what other ſenſe can be rendred of this circumciſion of heart, but that that cleanneſſe of heart which was ſignified to our fathers by circumciſion, remaineth to us though the ſeale be altered ? and this is that uſuall ſetting downe of Evangelicall duties and benefits by ceremoniall expreſſions: We under the Goſpel are circumciſed in heart without hands. Now how could that be, unleſſe the internall part of circumciſion did remaine to us? And this Mr. *Tombs* p. 33. doth confeſſe that the ſubſtance of the Covenant doth remaine; but ſtill helpeth himſelfe with his mixt covenant, which I have formerly denyed, and ſhall preſently evince : the different manner of adminiſtration doth not alter the Covenant : God did ſet forth, his promiſes of Heaven by Canaan: was punctuall in the ceremonies; but the ceremonies did lead thoſe that beleeved to better then the bare ceremony, without which, circumciſion and all their ſervice was utterly without uſe or benefit; God did in ſpeciall manner bleſſe thoſe outward duties to his elect, becauſe they were his owne Ordinances, cauſing them to ſee more in thoſe types, then they in their owne nature doe ſeem to manifeſt. And thus Mr. *Tombes* confeſſeth, *that the promiſes that were Evangelicall in the more inner ſenſe of the Holy Ghoſt, doe point at the priviledges* of *Abrahams* houſe in the outward face of the words: ſo that it may bee doubted whether this Covenant made with *Abraham* may be called ſimply Evangelicall : and this doubt is made the more juſt, becauſe Mr. *Tombes*, and ſome of his company doe not call the Covenant on Mount Sinai ſimply Evangelicall: what have you diſtinguiſhed between mixed and pure Goſpell Covenants, on purpoſe to make the Covenant with *Abraham* mixt, and is it now doubtfull ? and therefore doubtfull, becauſe Maſter *Tombes* and others doe call the Covenant on Mount Sinai mixt : What if they miſcall it? What ground then of the doubt? away with ſuch groundleſſe doubts : for wee call that Covenant, and all the Covenants that God made with man ſince the fall, purely Evangelicall, without any mixture at all ; and let Mr. *Tombes*, or any of his company prove the contrary : in the mean time, let me intreat Mr. *Tombes*, and all other that meddle with controverſies, to make no more diſtinctions nor limitations, then lawes of diviſion and limitation will allow : For, though at firſt they may win applauſe for their novelty, yet after ages will ſee their vainity, if any of them be taken up in a tract, yet times will come that will find them out: But all this while, Mr. *Tombs* doth not tell us what part of

the covenant was ſealed by circumciſion, or whether circumciſion did reſpect principally the domeſticall part or civill, or Evangelicall part, or equally all; nor ſhew any reaſon why the Goſpel covenant will not admit any ſuch mixture as he ſuppoſeth; but I do not love to inſult over a weak argument, or ſtrike an adverſary when he is dead.

Secondly, Mr. *Tombes* cometh to diſtinguiſh the ſeed of *Abraham*. I will not trouble my ſelf to repeat or take notice of what Mr. *Tombes* ſaith well, but of ſuch paſſages as he layeth down, upon which he purpoſeth to raiſe ſomething againſt childrens baptiſme: He indeavoureth to prove, that the ſeed of believing Gentiles, were not the ſeed of *Abraham*, the reaſon is, becauſe Mr. *Tombes* doth not finde them ſo called: a man may not heare himſelf or his neighbour called a man in many yeers; nay, ſuppoſe they were never ſo called, were they therefore no men? But it is moſt plain, that the ſeed of believing Gentiles were the ſeed of *Abraham*; for that is the knot of the queſtion, and God himſelf doth decide it. All that were by Gods appointment to be circumciſed, were in ſome ſenſe or other the ſeed of *Abraham*: or, otherwiſe there had been no need at all of calling the faithfull the ſeed of *Abraham*: But becauſe they are partakers of the benefit of the promiſe, made to the ſeed of *Abraham*: And this is made plain in the doctrine of S. *Paul*, he handleth this promiſe to *Abraham* and his ſeed, not as the words do import, but as they carry the bleſſing of *Abraham*, without reference to circumciſion or uncircumciſion, ſhewing that circumciſion was annexed to the promiſe but for a time, was but accidentall to the promiſe, and might be taken away, the promiſe remaining: This the Apoſtle doth moſt artificially prove, according to rules of art: For, *Rom.* 4. 10. his purpoſe was to prove, that now they were not to retain circumciſion, Chriſt being come, and baptiſme being ſet in the place and room of it; and that notwithſtanding the promiſe made to *Abraham* did remain; now that he might prove that, he ſheweth that circumciſion was not a proper paſſion to *Abraham* and his ſeed flowing from the promiſe, as the cauſe, and therefore may be ſeparated from the promiſe; circumciſion belonging rather to the ceremoniall adminiſtration then the eſſence of the promiſe; rather to the externall part of the worſhip then the efficacy and vertue of the promiſe; and this he proveth: Firſt, becauſe the promiſe was of force to *Abraham* through faith, before circumciſion, and therefore, *prior tempore*, before, in time to circumciſion, which it could not have been, if it had flowed from the promiſe as the cauſe: For, though the immediate cauſe be before its effect in nature, yet not in time; man is not *rationalis* before *viſibilis*, and therefore as the promiſe was before circumciſion, ſo it may continue after.

Object. But the promiſe was made to *Abrahams* ſeed, which we are not. To this I anſwer, the promiſe was made to one ſeed, not many, which is Chriſt, as *Calvin* and *Beza* explain it, not of the perſon of Chriſt, but believers in Chriſt; implying,

implying, that though there were a diſtinction between Jews and Gentiles, yet by faith in Chriſt they were all one, and the argument in *Gal.* 3. 28. doth cleerly ſhew this; neither Jew nor Greek, bond nor free, all one in Chriſt Jeſus. *Abraham* had but one bleſſed ſeed to whom the promiſe was made, which is Chriſt, ſaith the Text, *verſ.* 16. But I have proved the promiſe was not made to Chriſt in perſon as the ſeed of *Abraham*; but the ſeed of *Abraham* is reckoned in Chriſt, and the word Chriſt is taken for the myſticall body of Chriſt his Church of the elect, which in reference to the promiſe are but one ſeed, whether Jew or Gentile, ſo are the bleſſings and ſufferings of the Church reckoned the ſufferings of Chriſt. So that this ſeed of *Abraham* in reference to the promiſe, was never underſtood of *Abrahams* ſeed, according to the fleſh, but by faith: And here note, that this is not an univocall diviſion; as if the members did not *coincidere*, or, that ſome were the ſeed of *Abraham* according to the fleſh, and none of them his ſeed by faith, and others by faith his ſeed that were none of them his ſeed in the fleſh; nay, but this diſtinction is in reference to the promiſe as diſtinct from circumciſion; all thoſe were not of the ſeed according to promiſe, that were the ſeed of *Abraham* according to the fleſh; no, not of *Iſaac*, but the believers, theſe are the ſeed of *Abraham* according to promiſe, *Gal.* 3. 29. *If ye be Chriſts, then are ye Abrahams ſeed, and heirs according to promiſe*, elſe not: And this is not to diſtinguiſh Jews from Gentiles, but believing Jews from infidels, and to draw the whole vertue of the promiſe on Believers: ſo the promiſe is belonging to *Abraham* through faith, and the ſeed of *Abraham*, as the word ſeed is underſtood in the promiſe, and in the eſtimation of God is the Believer only; ſo that the ſeed of *Abraham* by faith, and the ſeed unto whom the promiſe of God to *Abraham* did belong are the ſame, the ſeed of *Abraham* and the Believer, whether Jew or Gentile, whether before or after Chriſt, are all one, in the eſtimation of God: So that the ſeed of *Abraham* that were bleſſed were believers only, not all the ſeed of *Abraham*, nay, nor all the ſeed of *Iſaac*, but in *Iſaac*, that is, in Chriſt, that was the ſeed of *Iſaac*, all that were in *Iſaac*, that is in Chriſt, of whom *Iſaac* was a type, that is, believers only, not all the ſeed of *Iſaac*; for the promiſe did not belong to *Eſau* that was the ſeed of *Iſaac*; for that, though he were the ſeed of *Iſaac*, yet he was not in *Iſaac*, that is, he was not inſerted into *Iſaac* as a type of Chriſt by faith; and therefore the ſeed muſt be ſo underſtood that the promiſe might belong to all the ſeed, *Rom.* 4. 16. not to that which is of the Law only, but that which is of the faith of *Abraham*; not to them only which were circumciſed according to Law, but to believers, though not circumciſed, (that is, after circumciſion was taken away by appointment of God: For, though circumciſion was not ſo naturall and eſſentiall to the promiſe, that it was enough at any time to entitle any to the promiſe without faith; yet, *virtute inſtitutionis divinæ*, was not to be omitted untill God took it away;) for the promiſe was not to

Abraham through the Law, therefore not through circumciſion, which was a legall right, but through the righteouſneſſe of faith, *verſ.* 13. to let us know that it was not any outward rite or ſacrament that can intitle to the promiſe, it doth but externally ſignifie the vertue of Chriſts blood, and by it the circumciſion of the heart, which in the ſight of God is the only circumciſion, *Rom.* 2. 29. He is a Jew which is one inwardly, and circumciſion is of the heart, in the Spirit, not in the Letter, whoſe praiſe is not of men, but of God. All this while the Scripture treateth of the ſeed of *Abraham* in the eſtimation of God: God accounteth none the ſeed of *Abraham* but in Chriſt, none heirs of the promiſe but in Chriſt, none circumciſed but them that are in Chriſt, and therefore ſaith, *Rom.* 2. 28. that is not circumciſion which is outward in the fleſh, and this, *ex regula de nullo.* Again, *ex regula de omni*, all that are in Chriſt Jeſus, that is believers, are the ſeed of *Abraham*, heirs of the promiſe, circumciſed in heart; but theſe have their eſtimation and praiſe not of men, but of God, and theſe are equally denied and affirmed to *Abrahams* ſeed, and Gentiles according as they are believers, or not believers, this without any reſpect at all to *Abrahams* ſeed according to the fleſh; ſo that *Abrahams* ſeed had no right at all to any part of the promiſe in the eſtimation of God, if they did not believe; and therefore, *Rom.* 9. 8. they that are the children of the fleſh, that is, *Abrahams* fleſh, are not the children of God, the children of the promiſe are accounted for the ſeed; and therefore, in *Gen.* 12. 3. the Lord did make the promiſe not to *Abraham* and his ſeed only, but from *Abraham* he derived the bleſſing upon all the families of the earth; all the families of the earth were bleſſed in *Abraham*: Or, as *Gen.* 22. 18. all nations are bleſſed in the ſeed of *Abraham*; and therefore do Interpreters interpret that former *by* [*thee*] that is, in thy ſeed, and all that are in Chriſt, are plainly the heirs of the promiſe, and none but they. *Abraham* in honour and title, was called the fountain of the bleſſing, but in deed and truth, not *Abraham*, but Chriſt; for *Abraham* himſelf was bleſſed in Chriſt, not in himſelf, as Chriſt was; Chriſt was only bleſſed and juſtified in and for his own holineſſe by the works of the Law inherent in himſelf; So that Mr. *Tombes* his diviſion of *Abrahams* ſeed κατ' ἐξοχὴν, Chriſts ſpirituall ſeed believers, naturall ſeed is moſt inartificiall, many of his naturall ſeed were ſpirituall alſo: *Abrahams* ſeed muſt be divded into equivocall and univocall; equivocall ſeed Chriſt, for that he was not like *Abraham* he was of *Abraham*, but *ex parte*, according to the fleſh, *Rom.* 1. 3. He was *Abrahams* Lord, as well as his ſon; his Saviour, as well as his ſeed: he was the promiſed ſeed, not the ſeed unto whom the promiſe did belong, as the ſeed of *Abraham*, but that ſeed that was the fountain of bleſſing to *Abraham* and all other his ſeed: and therefore Chriſt was the bleſſing it ſelf, the promiſe that was made to *Abraham* and his ſeed, was through the righteouſneſſe of faith, *Rom.* 4. 13. but the bleſſing came not on Chriſt through the righteouſneſſe of faith, ſeeing the righteouſneſſe of faith is derivative

from

from Chriſt to Abraham : Chriſts righteouſneſſe was primitive in himſelfe, and that very righteouſneſſe that became Abrahams by faith : and therefore is Chriſt the inheritance of Abraham and all the faithfull ſeed, *Eſay* 42.6. he is called the Covenant of the people, and a light to the Gentiles.

Secondly, *Abrahams* univocall ſeed were like unto himſelfe in relation to the promiſe; the word ſeed in the promiſe, I will be thy God, and the God of thy ſeed, is only the faithfull, nothing belonging to the ſeed of *Abrahams* fleſh, but ſo as they are faithfull, nor excluding any Nation, or family, or perſon in the earth, ſo as faithfull: as for *Abrahams* ſeed according to the fleſh, if not faithfull, *non eſt noſtri inſtituti*; it is not belonging to the doctrine of the Promiſe to conſider of them at all, Rom. 2.29. they were not to be reckoned among the circumciſed by God. Now for the particular application of this promiſe to this Nation or that, in one age to the family of *Abraham* according to the fleſh, in another age to the Gentiles; in one age under the ſeale of circumciſion, in another of Baptiſme; ſometimes to give a Nation the means of Grace, Word, and Sacraments, ſometimes to lead them away into captivity; theſe things were ordered according to the particular determination and purpoſe of God, though God did in a more peculiar manner bleſſe the ſeed of *Abraham* then other Nations, with the enjoyment of Word and Sacraments, and other bleſſings, yet they had them together with the land of Canaan, and the place of Gods worſhip; only on conditions of faith and obedience, as in Deut. 28. and 29. chapters, and by the many threatnings of removall of them by the Prophets, and their actuall captivities may appear; ſo that theſe graces of faith and obedience come on this or that Nation or perſon according to the purpoſe of Gods will, as likewiſe effectuall operation of the Word, and the particular effect of the Sacrament under the means of Word and Sacraments, wholly depend on the mercy of God according to the election of grace. Men are to adminiſter the outward rite and ſacrament according to the ordination of God : God by his Spirit beſtoweth his grace, and with-holdeth it from whom he pleaſeth: The Jewes were tyed to the eight day to ſigne the fleſh with circumciſion; but it was God that circumciſed the heart, without which, the circumciſion of the fleſh was no circumciſion in the eſtimation of God; as Rom. 2.28. which man cannot nor ought to take notice of, it is the way of God, no man knoweth it; it is God that giveth the new name that no man knoweth but he that hath it. Thoſe that have this inward grace of circumciſion, are called and accounted by God for the ſeed of *Abraham*, but whom muſt *Abraham* for his part in reference to this promiſe, account for his ſeed? the covenant on Gods part is to be the God of *Abraham* and his ſeed, which God knows how to extend to Jew and Gentile, and limit to beleevers even among *Abrahams* family. But *Abraham* had laid on him that hee ſhould circumciſe, but he cannot walke by Gods rules in the eſtimation of his ſeed, Gen. 17.10. This is my covenant that ye

keep between me and you, and thy ſeed after thee, every manchilde among you ſhall be circumciſed: the former part, I will be a God to thee and thy ſeed, might have ſerved *Abrahams* turn, if he had known how to eſtimate his ſeed, as God did by the beleever, but that was paſt *Abrahams* skill, therefore muſt *Abraham* have another rule ſet him to walke by; and leſt *Abraham* inſiſting on the word ſeed ſhould debarre many from circumciſion of the fleſh, whom God did intend to circumciſe in heart; he is charged with his duty in plaine tearmes, 12.13. verſe, Every manchilde in your generations, he that is borne in the houſe or bought with money of any ſtranger that is not of thy ſeed. And Exod. 12.48. When a ſtranger ſhall ſojourne with thee, and will keep the Paſſeover to the Lord, let all his males be circumciſed, and then let him come neare and keep the Paſſeover, for no uncircumciſed perſon ſhall eat thereof, one law ſhall be to him that is home-borne, and unto the ſtranger that ſojourneth among you: ſo you ſee how *Abraham* was to count his ſeed, not only thoſe that were indeed his ſeed, but thoſe that were of his family, nor ſo only, but the ſeed of beleeving Gentiles, were to be the accounted ſeed of the promiſe: one law muſt be to the ſtranger that ſojourneth, and to the naturall ſeed of *Abraham*: the beleeving Gentile that would keep the Paſſeover, muſt be ſubject to the ſame law with *Abraham*: he muſt circumciſe not only himſelfe, but all his males, and the reaſon is, becauſe no uncircumciſed perſon may eat thereof: the maſter of the family might not be accounted a circumciſed perſon, unleſſe all his males were circumciſed, becauſe that was the law of circumciſion, that he that was circumciſed himſelf, muſt circumciſe all his males, becauſe the bleſſing of *Abraham* was a family bleſſing, as *Gen.* 12.3. In thee ſhall all the families of the earth be bleſſed; and that which is there rendred by families, is in 18.18. rendred by Nations, All the nations of the earth ſhall be bleſſed in him: ſeeing all families, and all nations be of the ſame extent. Thus yee ſee plainly demonſtrated that *Abraham* and beleeving Gentiles were to underſtand the ſeed of *Abraham* in reference to the promiſe of the ſeed of beleeving Gentiles, which Mr. *Tombes* doth not finde.

You ſee the promiſe made to *Abraham* and all families, and all nations performed in ſome families, even under the law of circumciſion, the families of ſtrangers, the males that were borne in the houſe or bought with money, were reckoned as *Abrahams* males; but this ſtranger that would keep the Paſſeover, muſt circumciſe his males not under the name of *Abrahams* males, not as borne in *Abrahams* houſe, nor bought with money, but under the name of the ſeed of ſuch a ſtranger that would keep the Paſſeover; they could have no right to circumciſion, but as the ſeed of beleeving Gentiles. Againe, you ſee this promiſe is made to all Nations in *Abraham*, which muſt have a time of performance in that ſenſe alſo: but this was never performed in any nationall capacity before Chriſts time; yet God never maketh a promiſe, but he taketh a time in ſome ſenſe or other to perform

forme: but we ſee notwithſtanding this promiſe, God had not any Nation bleſſed but the Jewes, and therefore doth St. *Paul* plainly interpret that part of the promiſe concerning Nations in reference to Nations after Chriſt, *Gal.*3 8. the Scripture foreſeeing that God would juſtifie the heathen through faith preached before the Goſpell to *Abraham* ſaying, In thee ſhall all the nations of the earth be bleſſed: ſee God made his promiſe to *Abraham*, and all families, all nations; he began with Abraham and his, and ſome other few Gentiles families, and after referreth the performance of the promiſe as it concerneth all Nations to the times wherein he foreſaw that the Nations would beleeve.

3. Queſtion, whether there be the ſame reaſon of Circumciſion and Baptiſme in ſigning the Goſpell-covenant? To this Mr. *Tombs* ſaith, that the ſubſtance of the Goſpell-covenant was the ſame in all ages, yet this covenant hath had divers formes and ſanctions, where after abundance of words to prove diverſity of formes and ſanctions, he endeavoureth to prove a diverſity of the forme and ſanction of the covenant with Abraham, and forme, ſanction, and accompliſhment of the new Teſtament covenant: and from thence he inferreth his concluſion in theſe words. Whence I gather that there is not the ſame reaſon of circumciſion and baptiſme in ſigning the Evangelicall covenant; nor may there be an argument drawne from the adminiſtration of one, to the like manner of adminiſtration of the other. I have heard very much of Mr. *Tombs* his learning, and now I ſee wherein it lyeth, in drawing that out of premiſes that no man elſe can draw, and making ſyllogiſms with two concluſions, *toto cœlo*, divers, and yet make them riſe from the ſame premiſes: this is the learning ſo much magnified.

That which he principally gathereth is, that there is not the ſame reaſon of circumciſion and baptiſme in ſealing the Goſpell-covenant. For my part I know but two wayes of ſignations or ſealings, one naturall, the other *ex inſtituto divino vel humano.* Now I conceive both circumciſion and baptiſme doe ſigne or ſeale ſacramentally, and by divine inſtitution; and therefore there is the ſame reaſon of both their ſealings. Now the different forme of the covenant maketh no difference in the ſeale: If it be an obligation for money, or a leaſe under large or ample covenants, or a conveyance of inheritance, wherein one parcell of land of an acre, or one free-hold, or more; one mannor, or more, maketh no difference in the ſeale or ſignature, neither doth it vary the reaſon of the ſeale, which are *ex humano inſtituto obligatori*: neither doth the difference of the covenant with Abraham, and the Evangelicall covenant it differing, as Mr. *Tombes* would have, make any difference in the reaſon of the ſigning of the Goſpell-covenant by circumciſion and baptiſme: for grant that circumciſion did ſeale both Evangelicall and Politicall, and baptiſme only Evangelicall covenants, yet they did both ſeale Evangelicall promiſes, and for the ſame reaſon, becauſe God had appointed them to be ſeals: neither doth the mixture of one promiſe with another alter the

operation

operation of the ſeale, ſeeing the ſeale doth worke as ſtrongly upon every part of the covenant, or every promiſe in the covenant, as if there were but one promiſe in all, or as if every covenant or promiſe had a ſingle deed and ſingle ſeale: but all this while what Mr. *Tombes* hath here aſſigned as differences in forme and ſanction, are differences in matter, not in forme or ſanction: promiſes, the things granted in the covenant belong to the matter of the covenant, not to either forme or ſanction: things promiſed, whether Evangelicall or Politicall, paſt, preſent, or to come, belong only to the matter of the covenant, and do not vary the reaſon of their ſealing, which maketh the collection of Mr. Tombes ſeem to me very ſtrange; and ſo much the more, becauſe it hath the teſtimony among other things of a learned collection.

But, leſt I might be anſwered, that this was affirmed but barely, I ſhall deſire that all learned men would conſider what be formall differences of covenants, and what maketh the differences of ſanctions.

The formall differences of a covenant may be conſidered, either different *in formis verborum*, that is, when the ſame thing is granted in different formes of words: as when Chriſt is promiſed under the ſeed of the woman and the ſeed of Abraham. Secondly, covenants are ſaid to differ formally; if one covenant be abſolute, the other conditionall, one free, the other upon valuable conſideration; the one upon a condition already performed, the other upon a remaining condition of ſervice or rent; the one voluntary on both parties, the other voluntary on the one part only, and on the other impoſed: Theſe, or ſuch like, are formall differences in the nature of a covenant; as for formality of words, difference in them will not make an abſolute covenant conditionall, or the like: And conſider, I pray you, what formall differencee is there in the covenant with Abraham, and the Evangelicall covenant in Mr. Tombes his own ſenſe? was not the covenant with Abraham and the Evangelicall promiſe upon the ſame condition in Chriſt through faith? were not both in Chriſt upon the ſame valuable conſideration in our ſelves equally free? Do not we all ſtand bound to faith and obedience under both covenants, as you diſtinguiſh them? Did not God equally impoſe on us all the means of our ſalvation? Where then is the formall difference in theſe covenants you talk of? unleſſe you mean *verbis formalibus*, which make no difference in law or equity. Your difference you talk of, is but in matter, which I have formerly proved to be but imaginarie; but grant there had been a formall difference in the covenant, what had that been to the difference of the ſeal that ſigneth only *ex inſtituto*, by the command of God, conditionall, abſolute, free, or impoſed under covenant performed, or to be performed, all ſealed with the ſame ſeal, unleſſe the inſtitution put a difference.

But now let us conſider what difference there is in the ſanction: Sanctions are the ratifications and confirmations of a covenant, upon which the verity and bounds

bounds of the covenant are eſtabliſhed: are an oath: ſecondly, a ſeal: thirdly, a reward: fourthly, puniſhment: fifthly, earneſt, and perhaps, ſome other that my memory and skill will not reach to, but for all theſe they are the ſame to both covenants; for the oath that he ſwore to Abraham, *Gen.* 22. 16. is performed in Chriſt, the ſubſtance of the Evangelicall promiſe in your ſenſe: and Zacharias, *Luke* 1. 72, 73. doth challenge that ſanction as belonging to him, and telleth us plainly, that if Chriſt had not come to deliver us from the hands of our enemies, God had not performed his oath to Abraham. Now, if you look back to that oath, ye ſhall ſee that God promiſed in Abraham, to bleſſe all the nations of the earth, which was not performed, nay, not to any one nation beſides the Jews, not ſo much as by way of proffer, untill Chriſt came under the notion of a nation; but worſhip was reſtrained to Jeruſalem, ordinances to the Jews, therefore Chriſt gave his firſt commiſſion unto the loſt ſheep of the houſe of Iſrael, but after his commiſſion was to all nations; and therefore Saint Paul, *Rom.* 2. 10. entitles the Jews to honour, glory, and peace firſt, and alſo to the Gentiles: And in *Heb.* 6. 18. raiſeth comfort after Chriſt, from the oath made to Abraham, and from thence I can gather (however it will ſound in Mr. *Tombes* his eares) that the covenant made with Abraham did remain after Chriſt, or elſe the conſolation is but by way of analogie: For, what comfort can we have from the ſanction, if the covenant be void, unleſſe by way of analogie, with which kind of argument Mr. *Tombes* is much troubled, when he raiſeth them againſt himſelf, though many of his own arguments be nothing but analogies? Beſides, our Saviour doth uſe the ſame ſanction to the Goſpel-covenant in Mr. *Tombes* his ſenſe, even the covenant which he made with the believers in the new Teſtament, he doth confirm by an oath, *John* 5. 24. Verily, he that hearth my Word, and believeth on him that ſent me, hath everlaſting life; as likewiſe, *John* 6. 47. So that it is plain, this ſanction of an oath was the ſame unto Abraham and under the Goſpel.

Secondly, the ſanction of the ſeal is to both the ſame; for the difference of the ſeal doth not make the difference in the ſanction, for the confirmation is the ſame, whether the ſeal be a Lion or a Lamb: If a Prince ſhould change his ſeal from his portrayture to his arms, which he may do, if the Law forbid not, or by act of Parliament, if it do, yet the ſanction would be the ſame: circumciſion and baptiſme, though different ſeals, not different ſanctions.

Thirdly, for the rewards, they are the ſame, hell and heaven are the ſame; for that temporall bleſſing, and mixture of covenant, I have already ſpoken, to which I refer my Reader. But grant that there had been ſeverall ſanctions in reference to reward and puniſhment, what had that been to the difference of the reaſon, why circumciſion and baptiſme ſhould ſeal the Evangelicall covenant, ſeeing they are both but one ſanction, namely, ſeals? but the change of the ſeal doth not change that ſanction. Thus you ſee, how weakly this concluſion will follow from the

premiſes, and likewiſe, how falſe it is in it ſelf; they are both ſeals, and the reaſon of being ſuch, is the ſame, namely, divine inſtitution. But for the ſecond concluſion he draweth out of the ſame premiſes, is, that baptiſme and circumciſion are not to be adminiſtred after the ſame manner; did any man ever ſay that baptiſme and circumciſion ſhould be adminiſtred after the ſame manner, that were a ſtrange and unpoſſible thing to imagine?

His third queſtion, whether *federate, and to be ſigned are convertible termes*; and why *many were circumciſed, to whom no promiſe in the covenant made with Abraham did belong: as Iſhmael, the ſame may be ſaid of Eſau.* And why are theſe the only inſtances, I will grant Mr. *Tombes* more then he deſireth, that half they that were circumciſed, were ſuch, unto whom no part of the covenant do belong: was Abraham able to know that Iſhmael was a reprobate, when he circumciſed him? circumciſion was adminiſtred by the appointment of God, and was not ſo intrinſecall to the covenant, that it muſt be, *Proprium quarto modo, proprium tertio modo, omni ſoli non ſemper*, will ſerve: the time before Abraham, not liable to any ſeal, it had been ſin to uſe a ſeal before God gave it: and as for Job, Lot, and ſuch as lived in, and after Abrahams time, and were acquainted with this covenant with Abraham, they loſt the benefit of the bleſſing if they refuſed to be circumciſed, and what they did is not plain, the Scripture is ſilent.

After God had given the ſeal of circumciſion, all that were in Abrahams houſe, and all believing Gentiles and their ſeed ought to be circumciſed: in Abrahams houſe, thoſe that were not circumciſed were to be cut off from among Gods people, and thoſe ſtrangers were not to be accounted believers, nor ſuffered to eat the Paſſeover; if they, and all their males were not circumciſed formerly proved out of *Exod.* 12. Then all that were in the covenant muſt be circumciſed; as for the perſons that were not eight dayes old, they were not to be circumciſed actually, nor yet women, and yet were not uncircumciſed; *Privatio non dicitur de ſubjecto habili ante tempus ſtatutum:* as *catulus non dicitur cecus ante nonum diem, nec infans edentulus*; if he die before the eighth day, it is all one, as if he were circumciſed, being in diſpoſition to circumciſion: and the female, ſhe was likewiſe circumciſed as a member of Abrahams houſe, in that ſhe was the ſeed of Abraham, partaker of the bleſſing of Abraham admitted to the ſervices, offering of ſacrifices, eating the Paſſeover, though in her perſon ſhe was not, yet in her parent, in her husband, in her male iſſue ſhe was, which priviledges no woman that was not the ſeed of Abraham, or the ſeed of a circumciſed perſon might enjoy. Now, ſee I pray you, how this woman came in to help Mr. *Tombes* in his argument, that all that were in the covenant were not circumciſed, the bleſſing to the family were to all the family, but ſome aſſigned perſons were to be ſigned, but the whole bleſſed; if ye come neerer to all the perſons of Abrahams family that were males muſt be circumciſed; but what of that? not every member of the males,

but

but their foreskins, yet every member of their bodies were partakers of the benefit, ſo were the females partakers of the bleſſing of the family, the firſt fruits ſanctifieth the whole lumpe, the redemption of the firſtborne, Exod. 13. 13. did redeem the whole iſſue: why may not the circumciſion of the male, ſerve for the female? that which commeth within our conſideration is only this, whether any were refuſed becauſe unbeleevers, not becauſe women, or ſuch as God exempted.

But Mr. *Tombes* for all his abandoning of arguments, from analogie bringeth an argument from the like, and perhaps a greater reaſon: children are baptized in their parents. But perhaps not ſo great a reaſon, perhaps no proportion, perhaps no reaſon at all, perhaps ſuch a reaſon as Mr. *Tombes* upon ſecond thoughts would not inſiſt on; what, when God ſhall accept of the women to ſervices, ſacrifices, Paſſeover include her in the bleſſing, nor young, nor old, never require circumciſion of her, appoint the males, ordaine it in ſuch a manner, as without further explanation could not be executed upon her: how can Mr. *Tombes* think of proportionable reaſon from hence? that may ſuit with the baptiſing Infans in their parents which muſt afterwards be baptized in their perſons that are capable of Baptiſme in their perſons, by no colour of reaſon exempt: I pray Sir, let your next analogie have better proportion. Mr. *Tombes* proceedeth, *But it is manifeſt*, ſaith he, *that the Jewes comprehended in the Covenant made with Abraham, and circumciſed, were nevertheleſſe not admitted to baptiſme by John Baptiſt and Chriſts diſciples, till they profeſſed repentance and faith. Hence I gather that right to Evangelicall promiſes was not the adequate reaſon of circumciſion*, but Gods precept, *gratis affirmat*: he proveth nothing, only he ſaith, that John Baptiſt did not baptiſe circumciſed perſons before they profeſſed repentance and faith in Chriſt; notwithſtanding Mr. *Tombs* hath not proved, neither can he, nor any of his opinion, ever prove, that John did require that they ſhould profeſſe repentance and faith before they were baptized: it will not ſerve turne to prove that John required profeſſion of repentance to prove he required repentance: repentance and profeſſion of repentance, be two things; neither will an hiſtoricall narration, that this or that perſon did beleeve, prove he profeſſed his faith. But we ſhall ſcan this further, when we ſhall come to anſwer Mr. *Tombes* his other arguments. Hence that is from a thing not proved to a conſequence that will not follow if granted: grant John Baptiſt would not baptize circumciſed perſons untill they profeſſed they did beleeve that God did take away circumciſion in Chriſt, and appointed baptiſme in the ſtead; doth it therefore follow that circumciſion while it ſtood in force, was not dependent on the right to the Covenant, as the adequate reaſon why this or that perſon might be circumciſed, I ſhall put Mr. *Tombes* in minde of this collection upon ſuch an occaſion as he will not deſire to heare.

But let us ſee what aſſociate cauſe he will aſſigne, to ſhew that right to Evangelicall promiſes was not the adequate cauſe; Gods precept and mans right bee

a ſſociate reaſons, cauſes ſubordinate in *ſecundis cauſis*, be not aſſociate, much leſſe any cauſe or reaſon immediately flowing from the firſt cauſe is aſſociate with any ſecond cauſe, *cauſa principalis etiam in ſecundis cauſis non aſſociatur*, for then it could not be principall, *minus principalis tantum aſſociatur*. Mans right is included in Gods precept, or otherwiſe there can be no adequate reaſon taken from a topick place which is finite, nor any demonſtrative medium to prove them not aſſociates, ſeeing they are all joyned with the operation of God, *ſecunde cauſe non moventur niſi motis primis*; an adequate reaſon doth not exclude the ſubordination of cauſes, but only parity of ſociety; mans right to the Covenant doth not exclude the Covenant it ſelfe, God commands that all that have right to the Covenant, and none but they ſhall be circumciſed; is not here right to the Covenant *in ſuo genere*, the adequate reaſon when they and none but they muſt be circumciſed? the materialls of Gods commands are Covenants; and therefore in many places of Scripture are the commandements of God called Covenants. And Deut. 29.1. Theſe are the covenants which the Lord commanded Moſes. From theſe grounds ſuch as they are, Mr. *Tombes* denieth the major if univerſally taken, his meaning ought to be, if the propoſition be univerſall according to the limitation of the tearmes in the propoſition, the ſigne of the Goſpell-Covenant muſt agree to every perſon to whom the Covenant doth agree; not every ſigne of the Goſpell-covenant but ſome ſigne, it is ſufficient that notion ſigne in its univerſall nature be attributed *omni ſubjecto limitato*, ſo as it is limited in the propoſition. No man can deny this to be an univerſall propoſition, though living creature muſt be in a limited ſenſe, that every man is a living creature: though there be but ſome living creatures that be men; yet this is univerſally true, every man is a living creature: what ſhould a man talke of convertibility, no ſuch things found *in directa ſerie*, where are many univerſall propoſitions? If Mr. *Tombes* ſhould deny it, he knew how eaſily it might be proved, and therefore is all this ſtuffe before which I have cleared what chaffe it is prefixed, and you ſhall ſee what goodly limitations follow; but ſee firſt the proofe of this, if denyed.

Thoſe relatives that are conſerved in the ſame ſubject, they are both or none in the ſame ſubject, but the Covenant and the ſeal of the Covenant are relatives conſerved in the ſame ſubject, *ergo* the Covenant and the ſeale of the Covenant are both or none in the ſame ſubject: or thus, That ſubject which is capable of two ſuch accidents as are alwayes in the ſame ſubject, that ſubject is capable of both or none; but that ſubject which is capable of the Covenant and the ſeale of the Covenant, is capable of two ſuch accidents as are alwayes in the ſame ſubject, *ergo* that ſubject as is capable of the Covenant and the ſeale of the covenant, is capable of both or none. I have not concluded the major which Mr. *Tombes* hath denyed if univerſally taken, becauſe it is not a propoſition; the termes are not in *recto*, nor is *eſt* the *copula*, by means whereof a ſylogiſme cannot be made to make

that

that the concluſion; but from theſe concluſions, or any one of them, an Enthememe will riſe, whoſe conſequence is not deniable. Thus the covenant and ſeal of the covenant are in the ſame ſubject; therefore, to whom the Goſpel-covenant agreeth, to them the ſigne of the Goſpel-covenant agrees alſo, which is the very ſame in terms which he calleth the Major. The argument is the Pedobaptiſts; but I conceive the form is Mr. T*ombes* his; but why ſhould this be particularly true, and univerſally falſe, I cannot underſtand why one ſhould be capable of the ſigne of the covenant, becauſe he is capable of the covenant, and not another?

Now, for the manifeſtation of the proof, that they are alwayes in the ſame ſubject, the ſame inſtrument: if a covenant be written in one parchment, a ſeal appendant upon another parchment will not ſeal that covenant, neither is that a covenant formally ratified without a ſeal: Again, the truth of a ſigne doth depend on the connexion with the thing ſignified; ſo that if the buſh hang at one houſe, and the wine ſold at another, that is no ſigne, becauſe falſe, *ens verum & bonum*, be convertible: and if it be any mans duty to ſet up, or any wayes give demonſtrative ſignes, they muſt be ſet where the thing ſignified is, as neer as he can, or otherwiſe they be not ſignes; and this were a fooliſh thing in any mans apprehenſion, to ſay the land, and the deed for the land did belong to ſuch a man, but the ſeal of that deed did not belong to him, that was appendant on ſome other deed, and belonged to another perſon.

But let us ſee upon what limitation he will grant the major, as he calleth it; he telleth it is true of that ſigne of the covenant which agrees univerſally in reſpect of form and ſanction to them that receive the Goſpel, but it is not true of ſuch as are of particular form and ſanction. This is ſtrange logick, what can a Propoſition be univerſally true in reſpect of ſome particular? Again, Mr. T*ombes* limiteth the wrong term, what ever man did deny a Propoſition to be univerſall by limitation of the predicate: the ſubject it ſelf doth limit the predicate: as if I ſhould deny this Propoſition to be univerſall, every man is a living creature, with this limitation, that it is true of ſuch living creatures as are rationall, but of Lions and Bears it is not true, but ſee further into this limitation; he ſaith, it is not true of circumciſion; it is not affirmed of circumciſion, it is affirmed only of the generall nature of a ſigne, and conſequently baptiſme; circumciſion is not a ſigne of the covenant, it was, and then it might be applied to them that were in the covenant, but now baptiſme. A man taketh down an old ſign, and putteth up a new, the old is no more a ſigne, it is carried into ſome back place of the houſe, or perhaps burnt, it poſſeſſeth not the place nor office of a ſigne; as for thoſe juggling terms of form and ſanction, I referre my Reader to what hath been ſaid of them. But the minor he denieth univerſally taken, and here is all the knot of the queſtion, what labour is ſpent about the major is loſt; but that Mr. T*ombes* is not willing to grant any thing true that is alledged by Pedobaptiſts, all the children of believing

ving Gentiles are not such as to whom the right of the covenant doth belong only such as were his spirituall seed; the ground of this distinction is an opinion, that the covenant did belong to all that in any sense were the seed of Abraham, but the Gentiles cannot be accounted the seed of Abraham after the flesh, and therefore all the claim they have to the seed of Abraham is (as Mr. *Tombes* stateth the matter) according to the election of grace by faith; and therefore Abraham might circumcise all his seed, because the promise did belong to his seed. Now the seed of Abraham is to be esteemed either by nature or by grace; they that have any way had right to be Abrahams seed, have right to the promise, but the seed of believing Gentiles have no right at all, the believers themselves have a spirituall right. I have formerly shewed the falshood of this distribution, and that the seed of believing Gentiles under the Law, were esteemed as Abrahams seed in right to circumcision: now he telleth us they have right by election, but, saith he, *which is unknown to us but by profession or revelation*; implying, that those that baptize must know the election of them they do baptize, and that they can do by profession, these fancies I leave to their just occasion to be confuted. In the mean time, I briefly say, if no children were under the covenant of grace, we might baptize none, for as much as some are, we may, we must baptize all, seeing the distinct knowledge of them that are, from them that are not, belongeth to God, and not to man: and this was the rule that Abraham walked by, and that we must all walk by, as shall, I hope, appear.

But I come to the second argument. I have the longer insisted upon the defence of this first, because I conceive in answering what he hath said against that I have answered all.

The second argument that Mr. T*ombes* urgeth, as from the Pedobaptists from testimony of Scripture, is from 2 *Colos.* 11. 12. The argument he raiseth thus:

To whom circumcision doth agree, to them baptisme doth agree; but to Infants circumcision doth agree, *ergo*, also baptisme. The major proved.

If baptisme succeed in the room of circumcision, then baptisme belongeth to them that circumcision belonged, but the antecedent is true, *ergo*, the consequent. The major of the Prosyllogisme is apparently false, for to them that circumcision did belong, to them sacramentall baptisme doth belong, the contradictory is true, but his meaning is, that men of such condition, in respect of Infants, and he denieth, and cutteth, and divideth the major of the conditionall Syllogisme into such parts, that he may find out something, that he may deny: that it doth succeed baptisme he cannot deny, nor readily finde out a reason why a man of yeers under the Gospel should not be able to bear as much as an Infant under the Law. I speak this in reference to the dispensation (under the Law) of the promises, the condition of the Church is called infancy, the heir under age: now, how should a childe of eight dayes old, when the whole Church is under age, be able to receive

more circumciſion, and now the Church is at age, our Infants not able to receive baptiſme?

He telleth us, that *the argument ſuppoſeth baptiſme to ſucceed circumciſion*; it doth not ſuppoſe it, but proveth it out of *Coloſ.* 2. 11. 12. but he prepareth for a deniall ſo to ſucceed; that *thoſe perſons to be baptized, that by Gods appointment were to be circumciſed*, it ſhould be perſons of ſuch quality; but becauſe he taketh no advantage of that difference, let him alone with his own expreſſions. *In this ſenſe it is falſe*, ſaith he, females were not circumciſed, nor believers out of Abrahams family, as for believers out of Abrahams family, if he underſtand it of ſuch believers out of Abrahams family, as lived before Abrahams time, or before the Law of circumciſion, ſuch a plea, to prove all believers under the Law, were not circumciſed, were vain: for to prove exemption from a poſitive Law, by ſome perſons that lived before the Law was made were exempt; *but for perſons that were not of Abrahams family*; the promiſe was made to all families in Abraham, and they might be circumciſed, though neither bought with money, nor born in Abrahams family, but deſirous to eat the Paſſeover only, and ſo believers: they and all their males muſt be circumciſed, but for the females, circumciſion was given in terms, that did exempt females: baptiſme, to all nations, not males only, as circumciſion was, but females alſo: Beſides, the Scripture doth tell us, that the Apoſtles did underſtand all nations, male and female, and accordingly did baptize, *Acts* 8. 12. Now, becauſe God hath called in females, becauſe they are capable of the ſigne of baptiſme, which in circumciſion they were not, may you without warrant thruſt out Infants? or, doth it any way follow, becauſe ſome perſons of ſome quality are added, therefore thoſe that were before capable are now uncapable, if God had declared infants uncapable, as he hath women capable, we muſt have been ſatisfied? baptiſme may ſucceed circumciſion, though with ſuch difference as God is pleaſed to make; but becauſe God maketh one difference in reference to the perſons, man may not take liberty to make another: As for Job, Lot, and Melchiſedeck, or whom ſoever elſe you can name, we know, if they lived after the Law of circumciſion was made, they might come, and be circumciſed, the extent of the promiſe made to Abraham did reach to them; and what thoſe perſons you name did, you cannot tell, if they had any particular exemption, that is nothing to the queſtion, we know none had priviledge to the ordinance but circumciſed; and in plain terms, both in the old and new Teſtament, no uncircumciſed perſon ſhall eat thereof, *Exod.* 12. 48. and *Rom.* 3. 1, 2. this is reckoned the profit of circumciſion, that they had the Oracles of God, here is every circumciſed perſon, for that it is properly aſſigned to circumciſion, as the profit of circumciſion, there it is no uncircumciſed perſon; yet Mr *Tombes* will tell us, all perſons in covenant were not circumciſed, this is the reverence that is given to the Scripture, when it croſſeth their opinion, though they would make the world believe

believe that they were the only men that did respect the Scriptures; he should have made his personall difference by believers, and not believers: by Infants and men of yeers: and not by male and female, in or out of Abrahams house. Two sorts of succession (which he denieth) of baptisme to circumcision, is of time; because baptisme began before circumcision ended. What if circumcision did overlap a little, and baptisme did begin a while before circumcision ended? the same Gospel Christ in his person, and by his Spirit in his Apostles, did put down one and set up another, that is all I say to that; and surely it is so frivolous, I needed not to have said so much.

In respect of signification, here Mr. *Tombes* is put to his shifts, in some significations he confesseth, but not in others. First, I will consider the significations he alloweth, and observe, that wherein they agree, cannot hinder their succession, *they both signifie the righteousnesse of faith*, saith Mr. *Tombes*; but he must mean it doth sacramentally confirm or seal, not demonstratively signifie, but how soever, he doth agree that baptisme and circumcision have the same respect to the righteousnesse of faith; and yet the hinge of all Mr. *Tombes* his work is on this, that Abrahams seed were circumcised, whether they believed or no, none must be baptized but actuall believers, and yet circumcision and baptisme have the same respect to faith. Me thinks the bare acknowledgement of this is enough to dash all that any Anabaptist can say, the controversie is at an end, if there be no difference in respect of faith, why should faith be required more to the baptized, then the circumcised? certainly, I would have found out some difference, or found some other reason why Infants should not be baptized, then want of faith, or I would never have opened my mouth in such a case. I would never have confessed them both seals of the righteousnesse of faith, and yet the whole weight of the businesse depend on this; that one might be given in infancy to them that have not actuall faith, the other may not be given in infancy; for no other reason, but because they want faith. What is the reason, why circumcision, the seal, may be given where there is no faith, but baptisme the seal of faith may not; and that for no other reason, but because faith is wanting? What? may a man make a difference of a common accident? or make a genericall form a specificall difference, or a specificall form a numericall difference? this is all one, as if a man should say, that a Bear were not a man, because he can see, or not a Lion, because he can hear; and yet after confesse, that both men, and Bears, and Lions, can both heare and see: just so doth Mr. *Tombes*, baptisme doth not succeed circumcision, because baptisme must be given to believers only, yet confesseth, that both baptisme and circumcision have a like respect to faith; it is true, he assigneth other differences, but none of them will more disable from baptisme, then from circumcision: The first difference is, that circumcision doth signifie Christ to come of Isaac, according to the flesh, but baptisme doth signifie incarnation, death and resurrection of Christs,

Chriſt: doth this make the difference? can children better underſtand that Chriſt ſhall come of Iſaac after the fleſh, then that Chriſt is incarnate, dead, and riſen again? Secondly, can Infants better underſtand that the Iſraelites were people, ſeparated from all nations, then they can underſtand that all are one in Chriſt? can they better underſtand that the Law of Moſes muſt be kept, then that it is voyd, or the promiſe of the Land of Canaan, then of eternall life? The difference that Mr. Tombes putteth between circumciſion and baptiſme, cannot make Infants differ under the Law, and under the Goſpel, and do they differ by that which doth agree to circumciſion and baptiſme?

As for the place out of which this argument is drawn, *Coloſ.* 2. 11, 12. Mr. Tombes ſaith, that the Text doth not ſay we are circumciſed, becauſe we are baptized, but we are compleat in him, becauſe we are circumciſed in him, and buried with him in baptiſme; I muſt needs ſuſpect this mans learning, or his honeſty, ſhe he would never abuſe his ignorant Reader thus: what, Mr. Tombes, doth the Text ſay, ye are compleat, becauſe circumciſed? Let men that can examine the Text ſee, and they ſhall find, ἐν ᾧ καὶ our tranſlators have dealt more faithfully with us then ſo, that have tranſlated it, in whom alſo that is, we are not only compleat in him, but we are alſo circumciſed with the circumciſion of the heart: we have that mercy ſealed unto us, though circumciſion be taken away, and we might ſeem to be without that confirmation or ſigne of the purity of heart, which our Fathers had. Why ſaith S. Paul? Chriſt was circumciſed, and that gave an efficacy to the circumciſion of our Fathers circumciſion ended in Chriſt, and is not defended to us, but the effect of circumciſion is in the circumciſion of Chriſt, part of the body was put off, in circumciſion, but the body of ſin was ſignified: now this Chriſt did in circumciſion, not only ſo, but by buriall he put off that body, that became ſin for us, of both which ye are partakers, being buried with him in baptiſme; ſo that baptiſme doth entitle us to circumciſion of the heart, by the circumciſion and buriall of Chriſt, as the circumciſion of the Jewes was made effectuall by the circumciſion of Chriſt; ſo we have the ſame grace expreſſed by circumciſion of the heart, in baptiſme: it could not be plainer expreſſed, if it had been ſaid, that the benefit of circumciſion by Chriſt is made yours by baptiſme; Circumciſion was the ſeal of circumciſion of the heart to the Jews: circumciſion of the heart is ſealed by baptiſme to you; For it ſaith plainly, in whom alſo ye are circumciſed with circumciſion made without hands, in putting off the ſins of the fleſh by the circumciſion of Chriſt, the means of all this conveyed unto you by baptiſme; no man can deny that circumciſion in the fleſh, did ſignifie, and ſacramentally ſeal the circumciſion of the heart which the Apoſtle here affirmeth of Baptiſme. After all this incongruous ſtuffe, Mr. Tombes denieth that baptiſme doth ſucceed circumciſion, and therefore Infants are not as capable of baptiſme as of circumciſion; he hath confeſſed that faith is as requiſite for one as the

other, in regard they ſtand both in the ſame relation to faith, and thereby confeſſeth what he doth deny, and yet no more then the Scripture doth affirm.

Mr. Tombes falleth out with this argument, and in a metaphoricall way talketh of an Egge, out of which, if not reſtrainedly taken, nothing can be gathered: but that baptiſme and circumciſion in ſome things ſignifie the ſame; and do ſo Noahs flood, and the red ſea, yet do we not ſay that baptiſme ſucceeded into their place, much leſſe do we inferre any right to be inſtituted in their ſteed, reſpecting the ſame perſons; I do profeſſe I was troubled to parallel this non-ſenſe with any thing that might equall it: if we could get theſe Anabaptiſts to ſpeak ſenſe, a man might the better deal with them. Can any man make any thing of this after Mr. Tombes hath allowed that they both ſignifie the righeouſneſſe of faith? that both ſignifie the ſanctification of the heart; are they again turned into *materiam primam*, that Noahs flood might be parallelled with baptiſme, as well as circumciſion. You bid us take heed of ſuch argumentation; you might ſay baptiſme, and ſpeaking, in ſome things, do agree (*in prolatione verborum*;) and waſhing pots in ſome thing, in waſhing, in action with whatſoever we can do. Your argument to Noahs Ark, is *fallacia conſequentiæ à genere ad ſpeciem affirmativi*, thus Noahs Ark agreeth with baptiſme in ſomething, therefore in ſacramentall nature; as if a man ſhould ſay, *eſt animal, ergo equus*, it is a living creature, *ergo*, an horſe.

The collection that nothing can be gathered in a reſtrained ſenſe, but that baptiſme in ſome things ſignifie the ſame; yes, more then that, they agree in ſome things, we may gather in what they agree; they agree in the nature of a ſacrament; in divine inſtitution; in the ſeal of faith: they muſt be adminiſtred to all to whom the tender of grace is made, not only to all that are partakers of grace. The firſt, in reſpect of providence limited to a narrow compaſſe, and by the ordinance bounded within the nation of Jews, though not to the perſons of the Jews: all nations might come in and be circumciſed, and offer ſacrifice, and eat the Paſſover, but they might ſacrifice no where but at Ieruſalem; but now the ordinances are tendered to all nations, and baptiſme muſt be adminiſtred to all nations, no aſſignation of perſons by the commiſſion, ſurely the commiſſion was not invented by man: Chriſt commandeth his Diſciples to baptize all nations; here is not men, women, nor children, we muſt baptize ſome body; it muſt then be examined who they are that muſt be baptized? it is no will-worſhip to baptize, it is no will-worſhip to baptize all nations, to baptize whom we pleaſe, and refuſe others without ground out of Scripture, that is will-worſhip. Now, theſe perſons muſt be found *à ſubjecto capaci*, from the capacity of the ſubject, or from the judgement of the perſons in commiſſion to baptize. Your part requireth, that you prove Infants are unfits ſubjects, and I will prove in due time, that Miniſters are unfit judges: For, arguments drawn from analogies, I willingly grant to be invalid, if you mind analogies of proportion, to invent any part of Gods worſhip by; as if we had

had invented baptiſme by rules of proportion, but being commanded to baptize all Nations, and told that it ſhould ſtand us in the ſame ſtead that circumciſion, in reference to ſuch principles as concerne us moſt, and did equally concerne the Iewes in the ſame reſpects, and telling us now the particular priviledge of the Iewes ſhould ceaſe, and the ordinances ſhould freely be communicated to all Nations; never ſpeaketh one word of the particular qualification of the perſon of them that are to be baptized, he leaveth that to be underſtood *ex natura rei* under the Goſpell; God dealeth with the Church as fathers with their children; when they come of years tell them the ground and reaſon of things, leaving circumſtances, which neceſſity will drive them upon unto their own diſcretion; whereas when they are children the father directeth them to the ſenſitive part not acquainting them with the reaſon, but ſupplieth the defect of the infant with the particular direction of the fact to be done, having a care that he take not more upon him then he is able to beare; but when he becommeth a man if he ſhould ſtill continue in ſuch ſimplicity as inſiſt upon the ſame rule, and take no notice of any reaſonable inſtruction; nor by comparing his ſtrength with infancie judge nothing of his owne power, but ſtill looke for the ſame direction as he had when he was a childe, when the father chooſeth rather to inſtruct him by reaſon, then by ſenſe, he could not eſcape the juſt cenſure of a foole. God our Father telleth us that baptiſme doth circumciſe the heart, ſealeth faith as circumciſion did, Go baptize all Nations; this is enough for a man when he is told the nature of baptiſme by compariſon with circumciſion; and ſhewed the difference in caſe of women and appropriation to the Iewes, to direct them by a rationall proportion with what God did direct his Church in infancie: ye ſhall circumciſe no more, but ye ſhall baptize; that ſhall have the ſame operation upon the heart, and you ſhall not reſtraine my worſhip to Jeruſalem as of old, but goe to all Nations: If any ſhall further object, But what ſay you to Infants? I ſay nothing, but that baptiſme in reſpect of my worſhip, and the operation it hath upon the heart, is the ſame with circumciſion; and you know what direction I gave to my Church when ſhee was in infancie concerning circumciſion; you are capable of as much purity of heart as they were then: that is all I ſay; you are now of yeares, whilſt you were children I taught your ſenſe, now I teach your underſtanding; as for argument from analogie, though it doth come farre ſhort of an argument from precept; yet it is equall with an argument from example; for indeed all that can be drawne from an example is by analogie, and among analogies thoſe are more certain that are drawne from a precept, then thoſe that are drawne barely from an example, without any ſhadow of a precept, when the analogie is made by God, and we are led to the thing ſignified by Gods owne direction, and told that circumciſion of the heart is the ſame under baptiſme, as under circumciſion of the fleſh: how dare we ſay that infancie maketh men uncapable of circumciſion of the heart? when

God ſometime did declare, that that ſhould be no obſtacle to the adminiſtration of the ſigne, ſeeing we are truſted with adminiſtration of the ſigne not with the judgement of the heart; but as for that rabblement of analogies which he talketh of out of Durands *Irrationale*, they are things of no analogie with this. I further ſay, that it is not the proportion of the ſigne with the thing ſignified, that maketh a Sacrament but inſtitution; I hope no man will affirme that baptiſme wanteth inſtitution: and as for the perſon, if you will have him *adultus*, I make no queſtion you ſhall runne upon a greater neceſſity of will-worſhip, then by adminiſtring of it to Infants, as I hope upon further occaſion to make appeare.

Your third argument is out of the verge of your owne method, as not being drawne from any place of Scripture, and therefore I omit that, and come to your fourth Argument from the Acts 2.38,39.

He frameth the Argument well, if the Propoſition wanted not forme, it ſhould be they to whom the promiſe belongeth are to be baptized; but Infants of beleevers are they to whom the promiſe belongeth, therefore Infants of beleevers are to be baptized.

Mr. Tombes before he can make any anſwer to the argument, hee muſt fit his anſwer, that is, he muſt miſquote and miſapply two or three places of Scripture to the intent his Reader may conceive, that the promiſe that was there meant was not the promiſe made to Abraham, but the promiſe of ſending Jeſus Chriſt: others ſay ſending the Holy Ghoſt, all is one, if Chriſt had not been ſent, the Holy Ghoſt had not beene ſent; and the ſending Chriſt was the promiſe made to Abraham, as I have proved before out of Luke 1.73. But Mr. Tombes quoteth ſome places of Scriptures, as if a man in them ſhould finde ſo plaine a difference from the promiſe made to Abraham, and there ſpoken of by St. Peter, as muſt needs give full ſatisfaction to all that doubt of that: but let us view thoſe places, Acts 3.25. Yee are the children of the Prophets and of the Covenant which God made with our Fathers, ſaying unto Abraham, And in thy ſeed ſhall all the kindreds of the earth bee bleſſed; that is plaine enough of the promiſe to Abraham, Act. 13.32,33. And we declare unto you glad tydings, how that the promiſe that was made unto the Fathers, God hath fulfilled the ſame unto us, Rom. 15.8,9. Now I ſay that Jeſus Chriſt was the Miniſter of circumciſion for the truth of God to confirme the promiſes made unto the Fathers: read and judge, and judge what Mr. Tombes hath gotten by theſe places to prove any difference from this promiſe here ſpoken of, and the promiſe made to Abraham: But ſaid Mr. Tombes, the promiſe was made to them he ſpoke to and their children, & to them that are afar off, whether they be Gentiles who are ſaid to be afarre off, Eph. 2.17. or Iews in future ages, as Beza is doubtfull: indeed Beza doth argue that Peter did not then know the call of the Gentiles, or if he had, it is not likely that he would have told the Iews of it; it might be, Peter did not at that time know the Nationall calling of the

Gentiles

Gentiles that was afterward made knowne to him; for then he could not properly have ſaid of them that they were afarre off in reſpect of the Iewes, but Peter was not ignorant that as many of the Gentiles as the Lord ſhould call had right to the promiſe, and this was in no age offenſive to the Iewes: they alwayes knew that one law was to the homeborne and the ſtranger that ſojourneth among them, Exod.12,48, that is, when and after they were called; they were put into the ſame condition with the Iewes in reference to the promiſe; it is plaine that the promiſe in reference to Baptiſme is the ſame that it was in reference to circumciſion: now it is true he further teacheth the inner power and effect of the Covenant which was the turning men away from their iniquity: this is the doctrine both of circumciſion and baptiſme, that neither circumciſion which is outward in the fleſh is circumciſion, Rom.2.28.neither is that baptiſme which is outward, but that is circumciſion which is of the heart, whoſe praiſe is not of men, but of God. Thus baptiſme muſt be taught, it muſt be taught as from God, it muſt bee adminiſtred as by men; therefore ſaith Mr.Tombes, the promiſe is not made but on conditions of calling, and faith which may be confirmed abundantly, Rom.4. 13,14,16. let the proofe be examined, St. Paul doth handle the promiſe made to Abraham in reference to the fruit and effect of it, and ſo to entitle the Gentiles to the comfort and fruit of the promiſe, foraſmuch as the promiſe did alwayes beare that ſenſe, that never any of Abrahams poſterity had any benefit from the promiſe unleſſe they were beleevers, and that benefit the Gentiles alwayes had if proſelites, and now in a more free way; and this was ground to the Romans to ſeeke for juſtification by faith, becauſe that was alwayes the ſence and meaning of the Covenant made with Abraham; but this was the uſe that the faithfull ought to make of the Covenant: Abraham was juſtified by faith as we are; Abraham was not juſtified by circumciſion, nor we by baptiſme; circumciſion was adminiſtred in *facie Eccleſiæ*, according to the appointment of God, men had nothing to doe to examin faith, the praiſe of that was not of men, but of God: it is confeſſed that Abraham did circumciſe without any judgement of faith, yet had as much need of faith for benefit by the Covenant as we, his juſtification and ſalvation the ſame with ours by faith in Chriſt, Gal.3.9. They which be of faith are bleſſed with faithfull Abraham: ye ſee Abraham himſelfe had his bleſſing by faith, God preached the Goſpell to Abraham, the ſeed of Abraham had the benefit of the covenant by faith: whereby it plainly appears that circumciſion was not given by the eſtimation of faith, though it had its effect by faith; but every male of Abraham muſt be circumciſed, and that becauſe of the promiſe, the conditions of faith and repentance were not new conditions put on us which Abraham and his poſterity had not, though they are more plainly preached to us then to Abraham, God was the judge of faith in Abrahams time, and is ſo now, but the promiſe of the land of Canaan ſtood upon conditions of obedience the effect

of faith, notwithstanding circumcision: but, saith Mr. Tombes, the promise was not belonging to them simply as Jews, but as called, the promise did belong to all men, *quatenus* called, but it belonged to Jews, though not *quatenus ipsum*, yet it doth belong to Jews to be *fœderati*, καὶ πάντως, every Jew had an interest to the promise, though not *quatenus*, a Jew, because Gentiles also had this right, *per accidens*, as called, but it was accidentall to the Gentiles, some were called, and some were not; all Iews before Christ were called, but note, that called is to be distinguished into outward calling, and inward or effectuall calling: by an outward calling, All the Iews were called: by an effectuall, only the elect were called; whether Iew or Gentile, both these callings had their severall respects unto the promise, and the seal of the promise: The outward call had a right to the Oracles, *Rom.* 3. 1. the means of faith, and accordingly many had faith by that means, though some did not believe, that doth not make the faith of God of none effect; the promise of God signified by the word faith, in that place, is effectuall, though some do not believe, though it be without effect to them that believe not, yet it is effectuall to them that believe; and though he doth not believe, yet the Holy Ghost maketh circumcision an inseparable accident to a Iew, shewing, that the advantage of the Iew, and the profit of circumcision were the same, and the chief priviledge is, that unto them were committed the Oracles of God. Now, this outward call had the promise of God being their God, and the God of their seed, and accordingly had the seal given to them and their seed: this is plain in case of the Iews, they had circumcision, and the Oracles, and the promise, but all these are ineffectuall, without faith, *Heb.* 4. 1, 2. Let us therefore fear, lest a promise being left us of entring into his rest, any one of us come short of it: For, unto us was the Gospel preached, as well as unto them, but the Word preached did not profit them, not being mixed with faith in them that heard it. You see, many have the promise left them that may come short of it, they may have the Word without profit, the promise of God, circumcision without effect, all for want of faith, all these externall, have an externall dependance one upon another: those that were born in a believing family, had an externall promise left them, had cirumcision, had the word, though they might come short of the effect of all for want of faith; yet the externall administration must go by this outward rule; the promise in this place is understood in this sense of outward promise that belongeth to you and your children, you are called already; and that is implied in the opposition to these words afar off, such as are afar off is opposed to them that are nigh. Now, they that are nigh need no calling, but they that are afarre off, them we call; so that it is plain, calling is in reference to them that are afar off; and then the sense of the words is as plain the promise belongeth to you and your children, therefore be baptized: and the promise likewise belongeth to them that are afarre off, not yet called, as many of them as the Lord shall call: and this appears, in that the Apostle

speaks

ſpeaks unto theſe Iews,& exhorts them to amend their lives, and be baptized,for the promiſe belongeth to them, ſo that the Propoſition is immediatly true, they ſhall be baptized,becauſe the promiſe did belong to them;calling of them that are afarre off, is not at all immediately referred to baptiſme, but to the promiſe, and therefore cannot by any means be a limitation of ſuch perſons, unto whom the promiſe did belong, to make fit for baptiſme, as if there were ſome perſons unto whom the promiſe did belong, that were not called, and ſome called ; thoſe that are called might be baptized, but unto whom the promiſe doth belong, and are not called, they may not be baptized : but this is to alter the form and ſenſe of the Apoſtles words, though they might have a truth in them, yet they are not the words of the Text, nor ſignifie what is there ſaid : Amendment of life hath not relation to baptiſme, but to that ſin they ſtood guilty of, and that they were convict that they had crucified the Lord of glory: the immediate argument that he uſeth to perſwade them to baptiſme, is, that the promiſe belongeth to them, it is no argument at all why they ſhould be baptized, becauſe the promiſe belonged to their children, nor becauſe the promiſe belonged to them that are afarre off, but becauſe it belonged to them, that only was ground, why the Apoſtle ſhould perſwade to be baptized : what is further added, is to note the amplitude of the promiſe, to raiſe up their faith, to lay hold on the promiſe of ſo bountifull a God, that extendeth his promiſes ſo largely, not to them only,but to their children, nor ſtayeth his bounty there, but reacheth it out alſo to them that are not called, to wit,ſuch of them as he ſhall call ; you and your children, *ſenſu determinato*, them them that are afarre off, *ſenſu indeterminato* ; but if all had been limited by as many as the Lord ſhall call, S. *Peter* had drawn an univerſall concluſion out of particular premiſes : For, if that part of the verſe alledged, out of which the Apoſtle doth inferre this concluſion, or inference be limited, then the propoſition is particular, as thus : If the ſenſe of the words be, the promiſe belongeth to as many of you as the Lord ſhall call, then it is no more but the promiſe belongeth to ſome of you, a few of you, therefore be baptized every one, had been a very irrationall argument ; nay, if you reſtrain promiſe to its ſtrict ſenſe, for promiſe with effect to the effectually called, then it can belong to a very few of them ; therefore every one of you be baptized, were very ſtrange : The promiſe therefore muſt be underſtood in ſuch a ſenſe,as it was when applied to Abrahams ſeed, according to the fleſh ; as the faith of God in his promiſe, is not of none effect, though ſome do not believe, the promiſe muſt be underſtood by us, as left for all, though all attain not to it,and this not in reference to univerſall grace,but univerſall diſpenſation of means by us men ; and herein God did go before us by his owne direction in the infancy of his Church,leaving us to walk by the ſame rule ; when we have a more ample diſpenſation of the means of grace committed to us. God did command all Abrahams ſeed to be circumciſed, and all circumciſed to

eat

eat the Passeover, though they were taught alwayes they should not possesse the land of Canaan unlesse they obeyed the voice of the Lord, Deut. 28. and 29. Chapters: and all along, Moses and the Prophets preach the blessing to the beleever, and though under the forme of works, not the covenant of works; it was faith that God looked, as in Heb. 11. all the workes of the Patriachs are ascribed to faith, and Abrahams obedience is commended by his faith; and he and they justified by faith, and not by workes: faith grounded on the same truth of God, and the same Christ; God useth the same liberty of his will, Rom. 9. 15. in the dispensation of his grace, 13. An instance out of the old Testament in Esau and Jacob will serve as well as in Peter and Judas; the grace of God did no more nor lesse depend on Sacraments then now. God did not account any man circumcised but a beleever, no more doth he now baptized; Moses and the Prophets did teach faith and obedience, so do the Apostles, and that notwithstanding the promise; yet the unbeleever and murmurer shall not enter into the land of Canaan: thus went the doctrine, thus the estimation of God in all ages, the dispensation of Word and Sacraments to the Iewes, and them that were afarre off as many as the Lord shall call under the Law; but now to all Nations all are now called, God doth command all men every where to repent; in the sence of these words all the world have an outward calling. St. Peter doth argue with the Jewes to perswade them to Baptisme, *à notioribus*, they knew right well the bounds and extent of the promise; it was no new thing to them that the Gentiles called, should be accounted among these to whom the promise did belong: nor that baptisme did legally wash away sinne, nor that sinners must repent, but that the promise should be sealed by baptisme, that only was new: as for that Peter did teach repentance with baptisme both together, as saith Mr. Tombes, that is not the question; repentance and faith ought to be taught at all times, as being such things as God doth only look on most seasonably at all times to all men, Luke 13. 3. Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish: but out of this place it doth no way follow that repentance must goe before, or is required as a preparation to baptisme, verse 38. is an answer to this question, what shall we doe? we, that have crucified the Lord of glory? if to this generall question, what shall we doe? Peter had failed to instruct them to repent, he had been wanting to his duty, but presently to argue from the promise to move them to baptisme, and baptize them presently will scarce stand with any Anabaptisticall discipline; you would hardly have any great company of Catechumen's if you follow the example of the Apostle, which you so much stand upon, nay the keeping men of years, many yeares under the discipline of Catechumen's directly contrary to the Apostles example. But of preparation to baptisme we shall have further occasion to consider in other arguments. Mr. Tombes telleth us, that the promise doth not belong to all Infants of beleevers, which is the minor universally taken: he hath formerly

merly told us of women, and believers before Abraham. I have formerly given ſatisfaction to thoſe exceptions, but the promiſe is to be underſtood three wayes, as before may appear: Either firſt, in eſtimation of God, or, ſecondly, in diſpenſation of the inward grace of the Sacraments, and effectuall operation of the means, or, thirdly, in the outward diſpenſation of the means of grace: The two former are diſtributed according to the election of grace to the believer only, but the laſt, under the Law, to Abraham and his ſeed, and in Abrahams ſeed, which is Chriſt, to all the families of the earth: But now in a more explicit and plain way to all the nations of the earth; and that not only in *potentia*, but by particular diſpenſation, and providence unto many nations in *actu exercito*, actually many nations have the Word and Sacraments, and God grant more may have: But it ſeemeth, he granteth the promiſe doth belong to ſome of the Infants of believers, but which they are, he cannot tell, and therefore will baptize none: The way of God was to Abraham, that becauſe he could not diſtinguiſh, he ſhould circumciſe all: God commandeth baptiſme to be adminiſtred to all nations; it will not ſerve our turns in the day of the Lord, to ſay, we did not know who did believe, and who did not: it may, and will be anſwered again, who made thee a judge of faith? thou art a Miniſter of baptiſme, not a judge of faith, that is flatly denied thee: he that is a judge, is a Lord over them whom they judge, which thou art not: it were indeed great impiety, to adminiſter baptiſme to any whom we knew God had deſtinated to everlaſting damnation, but to take upon us to paſſe that ſentence on any perſon, were moſt high preſumption, much more on any infant: we have commiſſion to baptize all nations, but without conſent we cannot baptize any nation, and this is a good excuſe: he, ſaith the Text, ſpeaketh not of Infants, but children indefinitely: but it ſpeaketh of children in reference to the promiſe made to Abraham, which was extended not to Abrahams children only, but the Infants of beliving Gentiles, as before: thus of the Argument from *Act.* 2.

As for the firſt argument, taken from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. that the Infants of a believer are holy, I have already proved: that Infants of a believer, though not of the ſeed of Abraham, are federally holy, and that in the words of the promiſe made to Abraham doth appear: As for that the words in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. Elſe were your children unholy: I ſay, it may well be an alluſion to that federall holineſſe, as I conceive, though the argument be not ſo cleer, that among others more plain I ſhall inſiſt upon; yet not ſo improbable, that much may not be ſaid: for the preſent thing I affirm, that the children of believing Gentiles are federally holy, for the argument, I neither aſſert it, nor diſclame it, but refer my Reader to that that hath been ſpoken of that matter, by other men, whoſe learning and judgements I honour, and come to the ſixth argument.

The ſixt argument is taken from *Mat.* 19. 14. which is repeated in *Mark* and

Luke: ſuffer little children to come to me, for of ſuch is the kingdome of God. The argument is, that thoſe of whom the kingdome of heaven is, are to be baptized, but Infants are ſuch of whom the kingdome of heaven is; therefore Infants are to be baptized: For, that of coming to Chriſt, though the reaſon doth plainly convince that in this place, more is meant then a corporall coming, ſeeing many come to Chriſt corporally, of whom nothing is affirmed concerning the kingdome of God: as for his eight circumſtances, he hath gathered nothing for, or againſt the argument: they ſerve for nothing but to make a noiſe of Mr. Tombes his learning, that he can obſerve eight circumſtances, of which he rejecteth divers as not pertaining to the argument: the other he maketh nothing of, but that Chriſt did not baptize theſe children, which no man that I know, ever affirmed: but doth it follow, becauſe they were not baptized, therefore children may not be baptized? after Chriſt had given direction to his Apoſtles and Miniſters unto the end of the world to baptize all nations, and now telleth his Diſciples that to ſuch belongeth the kingdome of heaven: which kingdome of heaven in other places is underſtood of the ſtate of the Church, after the publication of the Goſpel, which began after that Chriſt roſe from the dead, into which kingdome, Iohn the Baptiſt never entred. Now, theſe little children, *Luke* 18. 16. were βρέφη, little, τρωθη, *recens nati*, young ones: Secondly, they were ſuch, unto whom the kingdome of God did belong: Thirdly, they were ſuch in their viſible condition they were in, and theſe things do all plainly appear, 1. that they were little ones, by the word βρέφη, the derivation, doth ſignifie, or ſhew it: but Mr. Tombes ſaith, words are not be expounded by their derivation, but by their uſe: But how can he know how a word is uſed, but by its ſignification: Suppoſe a man ſhould call a man that is grown a babe, for ſome childiſh condition that he perceiveth in him; doth it follow that a babie doth ſignifie a man of twenty or thirty yeers old? I conceive Authors do uſe liberty of words, but where infirmity cannot be laid upon the Author, nor penury of words upon the language, much muſt be aſcribed to the choyce of words, with conſideration of their derivation; but ſee what confutation, that they were not Infants, ἐναγκαλίζομαι, ſaith Mr. Tombes, ſignifies no more but embrace, ἀγκαλίζομαι, ſignifieth ſo much; the Preposition ἐν, may adde ſomething more then to embrace: but why muſt it ſignifie to embrace a grown perſon? becauſe *Mar.* 9. 36. he places them in the midſt, as though a child that can ſtand alone, might not be taken up in arms: yea, but he warneth not to ſcandalize them, as though a childe might not be taken up in arms, that may be taught to ſwear and lie, and by many evill examples, led out of the way of God, or cauſe to ſtumble, but the word βρέφος, ſaith he, ſignifieth a childe capable of teaching: it is apparent that βρέφος, doth ſignifie an Infant in his mothers belly, *Luke* 1. 44. Now, how long it doth continue βρέφος, is the queſtion. Mr. Tombes ſaith, βρέφος ſignifieth a childe capable of teaching: but ſee how he proveth

proveth it from the 2 Tim. 3. 15. ἀπὸ βρέφους τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας, whence hee gathereth that βρέφος doth ſignifie a childe capable of teaching: Mr. Tombes will put no difference between from his childhood and in his childhood: from inimateth that whilſt he was βρέφος, then he knew not, but when he ceaſed to bee βρέφος, then he knew: that is ſaith he, ever ſince he was a boy, then not when hee was a boy; but when doth a man ceaſe to be an infant, and begin to become a boy? For my part I underſtand not by what rules he walketh ſeeing they were infants in Chriſts armes, for ought Mr. Tombs hath or can ſay to the contrary: But ſaith he, they were capable of teaching, ſuch they might be though in armes; but how doth or can hee prove theſe children were ſuch? he will ſay the proofe lyeth on our part, that they were not capable of inſtruction: true, it doth if we will have any benefit by the argument, a demonſtration that they were not, I cannot give, but probably I can, and far before any you can give to the contrary: Firſt thoſe that brought them brought them not to that end that they ſhould bee inſtructed, but that he ſhould touch them and bleſſe them; neither doth our Saviour at all teach them, or ſay any thing to the children: certainly if they had been capable of inſtruction, he would not have omitted to have given them ſome ſmall directions, ſuch as they were capable of, and not have bleſſed them, and taught them nothing; for that derivation of βρέφος *quaſi* βρίνος *madidus*, that cannot be underſtood of the moiſture of temperature, which in ſome ſenſe is given to young perſons till they ceaſe to grow, till a naturall drith falleth upon their bones that hindereth their further augmentation, but that moiſture is ſuch as is on children new borne: what Mr. Goodwin ſaith of it, I have not ſeen.

But Mr. Tombes ſaith, that it is doubtfull whether our Saviour ſaith of them is the Kingdome of heaven, becauſe the word is τοιούτων, not τούτων, of ſuch, not of them. It is plaine our Saviour urgeth the relation they had to the Kingdome of heaven to move his diſciples to ſuffer them to come to him: now it could not have been any reaſon why theſe ſhould be admitted into the preſence of Chriſt, becauſe others had relation to the Kingdome of God, but the truth τοιούτος, hath a further emphaſis; for the words are not urged to ſhew a reaſon why the children ſhould come to Chriſt, but why the diſciples ſhould ſuffer them, and therefore Chriſt doth repreſent theſe children to his diſciples, not under ſuch a character as they did appear to him by his omniſcience, but ſuch as they were able to judge of, and therefore he ſaith, not τούτων but τοιούτων, as if he ſhould ſay, well ye have forbidden children to come unto me, but it was out of ignorance; now I tell you if any ſuch as theſe are ſhall come hereafter, forbid them not, for of ſuch is the Kingdome of heaven: The precept is given to the Diſciples *in terminis intelligibilibus*, in words, and in a ſenſe that may be underſtood by them: as if Chriſt ſhould have ſaid, To many of theſe little ones the Kindome of heaven doth not belong, but you are excuſed for that, inſomuch as the Kingdome of heaven doth

belong to ſuch, you are not able to diſcerne the difference, and therefore it cannot be laid to your charge that you did ſuffer any wilfully to enter into the Kingdome of God, that the Kingdome of God did not belong unto. But the Apoſtles might have anſwered, nay Sir, but we can diſcerne theſe unfit for the Kingdome of heaven, they have not actuall faith and repentance, and therefore we may not admit them into the Kingdome of heaven: to this our Saviours anſwer is plaine; the Kingdome of heaven doth belong to ſuch as theſe, therefore ſuffer them to come to me: Now for the further manifeſtation of the ſenſe of theſe words, the Kingdome of God is underſtood, either of the Kingdome of grace, or the Kingdome of glory belonging to the elect only, or of the Kingdome of the viſible Church where men walke under the meanes of grace. 2. The comming unto Chriſt may be underſtood of comming to Chriſt *motu locali*, or comming to him by faith as he ſitteth in his Kingdome of grace and glory: or laſt of all comming to him as he ſitteth in the Kingdome of the viſible Church: Chriſt hath a reſidence in the Kingdom of glory and in the Kingdom of grace. Now no man can come to Chriſt as he ſitteth in the ſtate of grace or glory, but by faith agreed on by all parties; but Chriſt likewiſe ſitteth in the Kingdome of his viſible Church, and teacheth them as the Prophet promiſed by Moſes, and there inviteth all nations to the uſe of the meanes, and commandeth his Miniſters to baptize all nations, and ſuffer little children, not thoſe onely that Chriſt bleſſed and gave eſpeciall teſtimony unto; but thoſe that were but like unto them παιδιαι, they muſt be permitted to come to Chriſt. Now the queſtion is, whether this comming to Chriſt is underſtood only of corporall comming to Chriſt or any, or in which of thoſe reſpects this comming to Chriſt is here underſtood; though I dare not deny a corporall comming to Chriſt is there intimated, yet this is not all that is meant in the direction, Suffer little children to come to me; for the bare comming to Chriſts perſon could not have beene inferred from this aſſertion, for to them belongeth the Kingdome of God. I ſit in the kingdome of the viſible Church to diſpence ordinances to all the world which I doe by my Miniſters: A Prophet ſhall the Lord your God raiſe up to you, like me, ſaith Moſes, and him ſhall you heare: according to which promiſe, I ſit alwayes in the viſible Church teaching the minde of God; as I thus ſit ready to teach, Suffer little children to come to me, for to ſuch belogeth the viſible Church: if thus you underſtand the Kingdome of God, and the belonging of Infants thereto, to ſignifie their intereſt to the viſible Church, then, come to me, ſignifieth no more in the direction then ſuffer them to bee received into the viſible Church, which is no more then ſuffer them to be baptized, or hereafter when ye ſhall have commiſſion to baptize all Nations, baptize them: Neither will Mr. Tombes his diſtinction ſerve turne, that thoſe whoſe is the Kingdome of heaven may be baptized, when it appears that the kingdome of heaven belongeth to them, the text is not of theſe but ſuch, that is of ſuch as have no difference

from

from theſe as far as you can judge in reference to the Kingdome of God, theſe are to be permitted to come to me. Now whereas Mr. Tombes ſaith ſuch, that is ſuch in meekneſſe, that is a liberty not to be allowed in interpreting of Scripture to aſſigne, or rather reſtraine the likeneſſe to humility, whereas our Saviour applieth the likeneſſe only in this, that they were little children, it was not *ſimilitudo qualitatum*, but *ſubjecti ob omnes qualitates*, for a ſubject cannot be ſaid to be like another, if any notable diſparity can be found: it is true if a quality be aſſigned wherein they doe agree, that one quality is enough to make them alike though they differ in all other things; but for a man barely to ſay ſuch as he is fit for this or that employment, he that is fit muſt be ſuch with reſpect to his skill, fidelity, and all other conditions requiſite for that employment. Now if any thing were named wherein they were like, it was in that they were little children, now that which they were a like fit for was the Kingdome of God: and if any children can be fit for the Kingdome of God, what unfitneſſe can be found in one more then another by any mortall man? therefore Chriſt ſaith, Suffer all children to come to me, for they are all alike fit for the Kingdome of God, the viſible Church and the inviſible too for ought you know: neither doe I know that the unfitnes of the Infidells childe is in the childe, but in the parent that will not bring it, nor covenant for it that it ſhall be a diſciple of Chriſt, nor undertake to bring it up in the doctrine of the Goſpell; nor is that man that is an Infidell himſelfe *fide dignus* to be beleeved in that point, but if he will ſell the intereſt of his child to a Chriſtian, I doe not know but that Chriſtian might bring that childe to be baptized as his upon that promiſe, that he will bring him up in the feare of God; I am certaine, notwithſtanding the promiſe was made to Abraham and his ſeed, yet hee that was bought with money might be circumciſed: all children therefore that are brought may be baptized, ſo as they be brought by perſons that have intereſt in them, and in any charitable conſtruction may be credited that they will bring them up Chriſtians: it is ſufficient for us if they be ſuch as unto whom the Kingdome of heaven doth belong, though the Kingdome of God belong not to them, neither can that any way belong to this argument, that Chriſt doth teach men that are of yeares humility from the emblem of a childe, yet one childe cannot be diſtinguiſhed from another (as more or leſſe fit to come to Chriſt) by their humility: for that Mr. Tombes ſaith Baptiſme doth not bring to Chriſt: I ſay, it doth as Chriſt ſitteth in the viſible Church, into which preſence the Miniſters of the Goſpell have commiſſion from Chriſt to admit all Nations, baptize all Nations; as for the kingdome of grace or glory, Miniſters certainly have no power or authority to keepe any out of them, or hinder any from comming to Chriſt by faith.

The ſeventh argument is from Acts 15 32,33. Acts 18.8. 1 Cor. 1.16.

If the Apoſtles baptized whole houſholds, then Infants, *&c.* but *&c.* *ergo*,

This argument, ſaith Mr. Tombes, reſts on a ſleight conjecture, that there were Infants in thoſe houſes, and that theſe Infants were baptized: but ſaith he, the words plainly prove under the name of the whole houſe, are underſtood thoſe only that heard the Word and believed. Hence he denieth the conſequence, implying that many whole houſes may be baptized, yet no Infants, becauſe it is poſſible they may be without children: And he further affirmeth, either theſe were without children, or elſe the children were not comprehended under the whole houſe, which he laboureth to prove out of the ſeverall circumſtances of the ſeverall Texts which I ſhall endeavour to examine along with Mr. Tombes, not only as he mentioneth them here in this *pag.* 20. of his Exercitation, but as in his Examen of Mr. Marſhals Sermon, from *p.* 137. to 142. Mr. Marſhall ſaith, that the Goſpel took place, as the old adminiſtration by taking in thoſe families together. This Mr. Tombes ſtrongly endeavoureth to oppoſe, and endeavours to ſet up an aſſertion oppoſite to that for true: ſaith he, the adminiſtration is quite oppoſite to that of circumciſion: the oppoſition which he fancieth, he feigneth to conſiſt in ſeverall differences: Firſt, that Abrahams family was ſingled out: the males only: whether in the covenant of grace, or not: children, or ſervants: elder or younger: at eight dayes old in the houſe, by the Maſter, or others in his ſtead.

For, his firſt difference was, Abrahams family only ſingled out for circumciſion, that is boldly affirmed, it is plain the promiſe in the ſeed of Abraham was to all the families of the earth: *Gen.* 12. 3. which is rendered by nations, 18. 18. 22. 18. there promiſe is made in the ſeed of Abraham, which in the 3. of *Gala.* is applied to Chriſt: ſo that Abrahams family is not ſingled out for the bleſſing, it is true, Abrahams family is ſingled out to be the line of Chriſt, according to the fleſh; many families could not have that priviledge, but the priviledge of circumciſion was not reſtrained to Abrahams family, but extended to all the nations of the earth, and was actually afforded to ſo many families as would dwell among them, or deſired to eat the Paſſeover, as I have formerly proved it: it is plain as many as would be, or were partakers of the bleſſing, muſt be circumciſed: but the bleſſing was promiſed *in actu ſignato*, to all the nations of the earth, though before Chriſt it was *in actu exercito* performed to no nation but the Jewes, yet many other families beſides Abraham were circumciſed; therefore that difference is not between baptiſme and circumciſion, that circumciſion did belong to Abrahams family alone.

For his ſecond diffence, that males only were circumciſed, I have already ſpoken to that: and the third, wherein all the knot of the queſtion doth conſiſt, what is here affirmed by Mr. Tombes, is but *petitio principii*: as circumciſion was to be adminiſtred in all the families that would eat the Paſſeover, whether perſons that were circumciſed did belong to the covenant of grace, or not; ſo is baptiſme, there being no man on earth, that can judge of any but himſelf, whether he be-

long

long to the covenant of grace or no: As for the circumciſion of children, ſervants, elder, younger, I know not baptiſme doth make any more difference then circumciſion doth; for that in the houſe, and by the Maſter of the family, or ſome in his ſtead; I ſay, that in Abrahams time, all the publike offices of King and Prieſt, were in Abrahams perſon; Levi was in the loines of Abraham, what hand the Prieſt or the Judge had in the act of circumciſion, the Scripture is ſilent: but certainly, whether it were to be adminiſtred privately or publikely, there muſt be a publike account given of it, for as much as the perſon that was not circumciſed muſt be cut off, which could not be done, but by a publike act; neither do I know a more publike diſpenſation under the Goſpel ſhould inforce a more particular adminiſtration: but the agreement in the laſt circumſtance, is that whereon the argument doth reſt: that is, that whole families were brought to baptiſme under the Goſpel: To which Mr. Tombes ſaith, that it was but contingent to families; that they were baptized, no precept, no propheſie for it: contingent it is, I confeſſe, in reſpect of any cauſes, that any nation, family, or perſon in the world ſhould be baptized, but that nations ſhould be baptized, is not without either precept or propheſie: the Apoſtles are commanded to baptize all nations, the bleſſing is promiſed to all nations in Abraham, and all nations are propheſied to flow to the mountain of Gods Church, *Iſai.* 2. but we find not infants baptized, nor families baptized in conformity to circumciſion: Mr. Tombes ſaith, that the conformity is not intimated: I ſay, that families were baptized, the conformity ariſeth of it ſelf; But Mr. Tombes deſireth to elude this argument, by ſhewing that actuall faith was firſt required in every perſon before he were baptized; and therefore the Apoſtles did not baptize any, but ſuch as actually did believe, and make profeſſion of their faith; ſo that they did not baptize any family, unleſſe upon particular cognizance of every particular mans faith; this you ſhall ſee how fairly he will prove: as for the examples from John, and before the commiſſion, I know they walked by ſpeciall light, but what, we cannot tell, after they had their commiſſion, certainly they walked by it: The firſt inſtance after the reſurrection, is *Acts* 2. 41. they that gladly received the Word of God were baptized, and why ſhould they not? did ever any deny, that ſuch as received the Word of God ſhould be baptized? and theſe are they, ſaith Mr. Tombes, to whom he ſaid, *vers.* 39. the promiſe belongeth to you and to your children, added three thouſand ſouls, yet never a child baptized; men may as well ſay, never a man, or never a woman: from the word ſouls, an Infant may be called a ſoul, as well as men or women; but, ſaith Mr. Tombes, the Text ſaith, thoſe that received the Word were baptized; doth it ſay, their children were not? but Mr. Tombes confeſſeth they were the ſame perſons that gladly received the Word of God, unto whom Peter had ſaid, the promiſe did belong to them and their children, that was the Word they gladly received: And Saint Peter inferreth from this, that

the

the promiſe did belong to them, that they ſhould therefore be baptized, becauſe the promiſe did belong to them.

Now if this argument from the promiſe was good concerning them, why is it not as good for their children? and if they received the word of the promiſe gladly for themſelves, it is likely if it had been denied them in reſpect of their children, they would ſome of them have had the boldneſſe to have asked it for their children; and ſaid, Peter, you told us of the promiſe, that it belonged to our children to as well as us; and you told us that that was a good reaſon why wee ſhould be baptized, and accordingly we are baptiſed: why ſhould not that be a ground for our children to be baptized alſo? we know no reaſon why that ſhould be a reaſon for us to be baptized and not for them: You tell us the promiſe doth belong to them as well as to us; as for the limitation of as many as the Lord ſhall call, that is to be referred to them that are afarre off, not to us: afarre off, is oppoſed to them that are neare, Epheſians 2,13. You that were farre off are made nigh by the bloud of Chriſt: farre off, ſignifieth them that are not yet called, nigh, them that are called; to looke on the words in their originall ſenſe, we do not uſe to call them that are nigh already, but them that are afarre off, that they may come nigh: and this appeareth plainly to be the ſenſe; by that here are ſeverall ſubjects of the promiſe, you are the ſubject of the promiſe, and your children and they that are farre off: You are not your children, your children are not you, you nor your children are not afarre off, they that are afarre off muſt be called, that they may be nigh, that ſo the promiſe may belong to you all, that ſo ye may all be baptized. What Mr. Goodwins fancie is, Mr. T. doth not tell us, nor have I ſeen or heard, but cannot be denied that the word ſoules doe comprehend men, women and children; for though there be ſome difference in their bodies, yet they agree all in this that they be ſoules taken for perſons; though for my part, I will not argue from hence, that children were baptized; yet I ſay from hence is clearly evinced, that children have a right and intereſt to baptiſme, becauſe to the promiſe, and that as clearly as any thing can be: for that which is a cauſe producing an effect in one ſubject, will produce the ſame effect in another, *poſita cauſa ponitur effectus rationale eſt riſibile*, is as true in children, as in men; he to whom the promiſe doth belong, may be baptized, is as true in children as in men, if the promiſe doth belong to them both, as the text plainly ſaith it doth; and the pointing of the Greeke text doth plainly declare this to be the meaning of the words: for there is no point between you and your children, but between children and them that are afarre off, to ſhew the promiſe belonged to them and their children in their preſent condition to them that are afarre off after their call: where note that the promiſe is to bee underſtood in the externall or internall conſideration: according to the externall Sacraments have their adminiſtration amongſt men; which tearmes ye have applyed to Jews and circumciſion, Rom. 2. 29. He is a Jew

which

which is one inwardly, and circumciſion is that of the heart in Spirit, and not the Letter, whoſe praiſe is not of men, but of God; the Letter ſaith, God will be the God of Abraham and his ſeed, but the ſpirit ſaith, that he will be ſo to the elect and faithfull: The Letter ſaith, every male ſhall be circumciſed; the Spirit ſaith, that circumciſion is no circumciſion which is outward, but that which is of the heart: the Letter looketh on the family of Abraham, either by generation or by communion; the Spirit on a remnant only, according to the election of grace: the Letter requireth circumciſion or cutteth off, ſome ſay [Goodwins antiq. Ainſworth *in locum*;] the parent, ſome ſay, the child for the neglect; thus external performance hath its praiſe or diſpraiſe of men, but that of the Spirit hath its praiſe not of men, but of God: To this latter, only faith and repentance is required, or rather both; circumciſion of the heart, and baptiſme of the heart, are nothing elſe but faith and repentance which God can judge, and praiſe not man; and thus the promiſe, according to the Letter, did belong to thoſe Jews, to whom Peter ſpake, even before their effectuall call; and this Peter urgeth to them as a motive to move them to be baptized: as if he ſhould have ſaid, upon this ground ye were circumciſed, and now upon the ſame ground ye may be baptized; it is true, we are not only Miniſters of the Letter, but of the Spirit, and therefore we preach faith and repentance as requiſite to your baptiſme of the Spirit; but you muſt give account of that to God, and not to us, we can take no account of it, we are not Lords and Judges of your faith, we preach all the duties that belong to the inward man, but adminiſter ſacraments and guide our charity towards our brethren by outward rules, it muſt ſatisfie us: if you will come and claim your intereſt to the promiſe, both for your ſelves and your children, we muſt baptize you and your children; we will teach what account ye muſt make to God of your faith and repentance, how you muſt bring up your children in the feare of God, but we can take account of none of theſe things. The next place of Scripture which he taketh in to this confutation, is *Acts* 8. 12. by which he proveth that the Apoſtles did not take in whole families at once, becauſe the whole City of Samaria: we prove a perſonall account of all to be baptized, was not required, becauſe they were taken in by whole families in the Apoſtles time, and Mr. Tombes confuſeth this, by ſaying, they were taken in by whole cities; I like ſuch confutations. Next, out of *Acts* 8. 38. and 9. 18. he proveth that the Eunuch and Paul, ſingle perſons were baptized; brave arguments, therefore families were not baptized, the Apoſtles had a commiſſion to baptize all nations, and accordingly they performed their commiſſion with all expedition, taking in families, cities, nations, ſingle perſons, refuſing none that would enter themſelves in the School of Chriſt: Chriſt is not like a Grammar-ſchool-maſter, that will receive no ſchollers, unleſſe they be entred before; he teacheth from the teat to the grave, from the A B C, to perfection; the next is of Cornelius, his houſhold was

baptized, as may be gathered out of Acts 11.14. ſaith Mr. Tombes, though I conceive he miſtaketh the place: the baptiſme of Cornelius family is 10.48. But this houſhold was not an ordinary houſhold, but a garriſon of Souldiers, what matter is there in that; what did Peter cauſe them to be baptized, for feare, becauſe they were Souldiers, God told Cornelius before Peter came, that he ſhould tell them words by which he and all his houſhold ſhall be ſaved? Mr. Tombes infereth that all Cornelius houſhold were ſaved: good Charity, but bad Logick; that becauſe there was vertue in the word to ſave him and all his houſhold, therefore all his houſhold were ſaved: in the 1 Cor. 1.16. Paul baptized the houſhold of Stephanus, but ſaith Mr. Tombs in 16.15. the houſhold of Stephanus is addicted to the Miniſtery of the Saints; what is this to the purpoſe? did ever any man ſay that thoſe that were baptized ſhould never after be good for any thing? he ſaith, ſome things of Criſpus and others, that the houſhold is underſtood for them that beleeve in the houſe; but comming to Lydia, he hath nothing to ſay from any circumſtance of that text, to prove that any of Lydias houſe did beleeve but herſelfe, but ſaith it muſt be interpreted by other places where they expreſſe baptizing whole houſholds, they expreſſe beleeving and receiving the word by the whole houſhold: ſtrange that one hiſtory ſhall be expounded by another, becauſe one houſhold received the word and beleeved, therefore another houſhold that was baptized, did likewiſe beleeve: an hiſtory can but inferre that ſome that did beleeve were baptized: but ſaith Mr. Tombes, the frequent uſe of the word houſhold for growne men in the houſe, Mat. 10.13. if the houſe be worthy, certainly what portion may be aimed at, as for whoſe ſake the houſe is ſaid to bee worthy of the Apoſtles abode in it is uncertaine; the houſe there is underſtood of all, little and great, your peace is no more, but your prayers: now firſt the worthineſſe may be found in the Maſter of the family alone, and the Apoſtles may pray for the whole family little and great.

But now Mr. Tombes will fall upon ſome argument, to prove that the Apoſtles did not take in familes, for then ſaith he, if it be true that the preſident bee an houſhold, I demand whether we muſt baptize wife and ſervants becauſe they profeſſe the faith, or becauſe they be of the houſhold? if becauſe of the houſhold whether profeſſing faith or not, then an unbeleeving wife or ſervant ſhould bee baptized becauſe they are of the houſhold; unleſſe it be ſuppoſed that the husband or maſter being a beleever, the wife or ſervant cannot be an unbeleever; the contrary ſaith he appeareth: and thus Mr. Tombs hath done his doe, and then cryeth abſurd: but where lyeth the force of his inferences, and the abſurdity I cannot tell; Mr. Marſhall and Mr. Blake ſay, whole houſholds were taken in; but it follows all houſholds muſt come in; all or none, all that is inferred out of that, is, that the Goſpell may be received by a family: and maſter of the family may tender all his family to baptiſme, & the commiſſioner to baptize all the world, need enquire

no

no further into the profeſſion of the family, but may take the teſtimony of the Maſter for the whole family; for you change a terme, and ſay, if a wife or a ſervant, make not profeſſion of faith (you minde to the Miniſter) then an unbeleever may be baptized, and ſo he may, though they ſhould make profeſſion of faith: but you throughout your whole Diſcourſe, make faith, and profeſſion of faith all one; *cum Anabaptiſtico*, for lay that miſtake aſide which you muſt doe, and all Anabaptiſts mouthes are ſtopt; for it is one thing to beleeve, and another to make profeſſion of faith: you much talke of this houſhold, and that houſhold beleeving; but ſhew me any but the Eunuch that made any profeſſion of faith before baptiſme, in which caſe Philip did not teach him to confeſſe his faith, but to beleeve only: it cannot be denyed, that the doctrin of faith ought to be taught to men of yeares, and that not as a preparation to baptiſme only, but for that the doctrine of faith is neceſſary to all actions; whatſoever is not of faith is ſinne: that which we argue from receiving of families, and from the Apoſtles commiſſion to baptize Nations, is that Nations may make Lawes for their whole Nations to be baptized; and if the major part of a Nation doe according to their duty receive baptiſme, and undertake for the whole Nation to ſubmit themſelves to become ſhollers of Chriſt, they may juſtly compell by any penalty to joyne with them in the externall worſhip of God, *Deum eſſe & colendum*, is the Law of Nature: all Nations have ever agreed to ſerve ſome God, without which no humane ſociety can be preſerved: all ſocieties are united by a Covenant confirmed by an oath in the name of ſome God, and doe agree upon ſome publike worſhip of their God: but may not a Chriſtian Nation agree upon the ſervice of God in Chriſt? may they not enrole themſelves the Diſciples of Chriſt, and ſubmit to the publike worſhip of God, of which baptiſme is the firſt? this therefore is it which is drawne from the commiſſion directed to the Diſciples for the baptizing of Nations, that Nations may act as Nations, and families as families; that is, that the more organicall parts muſt act for the reſidue, the Magiſtrates for the Nation, the Maſter of the family for the family; otherwiſe it cannot be ſaid to be the act of the Nation, or of the family, though a *poſt factum* may be hiſtorically related to overſpread a Nation that is done without any Nationall conſent to ſhew the univerſality of a ſpreading evill: yet where a duty is charged upon a Nation, it cannot be orderly received without a Nationall conſent: and that of the Gaolers houſhold doth appeare to be acted by his conſent, as the text is plaine, Act. 16. 32. Paul preached to all in the houſe, but in 33. it is ſaid the the Gaoler was baptized and all his: as if the text ſhould have ſaid, there were divers in the houſe that heard the word that the Gaoler had nothing to doe with, but thoſe that were his he would preſent to Paul to be baptized. Now whereas in 34. verſe it is urged by Mr. Tombes that he rejoyced beleeving in God with all his houſe: I confeſſe Paſſor and others render πανοικι ſo; yet it is an adverbe of place, and can reaſonably ſignifie no

more but the place where he rejoyced; beſides if παντὶ ſhould ſignifie with all the houſe, it muſt ſignifie more then were baptized, becauſe none were baptized but his, and if under the name of his, then he had an intereſt in preſenting them. Now man can have no more intereſt in any then in his children, they are his in a more eſpeciall manner; ſo that if he had any children, it is apparent they were baptized, or elſe they were none of his, all his were baptized: And whereas Mr. Tombes ſaith, all the houſhold beleeved, or all that were baptized beleeved; it is plaine that the Maſter of the houſe onely is ſaid to beleeve, for the participle πεπιστευκὼς is referred to the nominative caſe, the adverbe that is παντὶ though it ſhould be tranſlated with all his houſe, is to be referred to the verbe, which is ἠγαλλιάσατο rejoyced, they rejoyced to ſee their maſter or father ſo merry: if beleeving had been referred to all the houſe, it muſt have been μετ' ὅλου πεπιστευκότος, *domo credente* with his houſe beleeving; whereas it is now to be rendred, he beleeving rejoyced with all his houſhold, none is ſaid to beleeve but himſelfe as in Lydias caſe, is likewiſe plaine: from whence it will appeare that a beleeving maſter may preſent his ſervant and children to baptiſme, though it doth not follow that a beleeving maſter may or will preſent thoſe of his ſervants or children, that are adult or of yeares without their conſent, yet he may by his authority require them to it as an externall duty; he cannot compell them to any duty, or reſtraine them from any vice without their conſent, yet he may correct them, and incline their will to any outward duty by his authority, and having wrought upon them to conſent and ſubmit, the commiſſioner may baptize them that come ſo preſented: the maſter of a family is a King, a Prophet, and a Prieſt, if by any of theſe offices he can prevaile with his houſhold, he may bring them to the performance of their duties: Now baptizing as a duty and precept lyeth on the Miniſter *antecedenter* to the faith of the baptized; and is at leaſt annexed to doctrine, and not to faith, they muſt teach and baptize all Nations: now it is plaine they muſt teach as well them that beleeve not, as them that beleeve; againe baptizing is *modus docendi*, a manner of teaching; as I have ſaid, and ſhall further be made appeare upon occaſion. Now whereas Mr. Tombes further ſaith, that then it will follow that the whole houſhold muſt neceſſarily beleeve if the Maſter doth, and proveth that ſome time it falleth out otherwiſe: I ſay, that though it bee the maſter or husbands duty to move his family, yet he cannot alwaies prevaile; and ſpeciall direction concerning the wife is given to ſuffer her in regard of the bond of Matrimony and that under ſome limited and reſtrained tearms in hope of her converſion; yet nothing is ſaid concerning ſervants but that he may either force them or be rid of them if they continue Infidels in that ſenſe, that is refuſe to liſt themſelves among Diſciples; the publike worſhip of ſome God being the bound of all humane ſociety, 101. Pſ. 6. He that walketh in a perfect way, he ſhall ſerve me: he that keepeth any ſervant that will not be baptized, is not a good Chriſtian;

it is true, all men of diſcretion ought to conſent to every duty; but baptiſme is a duty without conſent, as all other precepts are, it is *pactum impoſitum*, as before; and ſo I come to follow his arguments, lapping up two or three of them, becauſe he maketh ſleight of the arguments, we ſhall take occaſion to ſhew the weakneſſe of ſome of his anſwers, and where the arguments be weak, the weakneſſe is his, to bring them in.

The firſt argument of this ſort, is taken from the generall promiſes to the godly and their ſeed, this hath already been handled how they conclude for baptiſme from *Exod.* 20. 6. *Pſal.* 112. 2. he ſaith they are for the moſt part concerning temporall things, then ſpirituall alſo, as confeſſed, generall and indefinite; if generall and indefinite it muſt be ſo by reaſon of the neceſſity of the matter, otherwiſe indefinite would be particular; election doth not ſtop children, they are elect when children, or never; theſe promiſes are with condition of faith and repentance, therefore not belonging to this place, ſaith Mr. Tombes. Well, then he was too blame to bring it.

2. *Iſai.* 49. 22. it is foretold, that Gentiles ſhould bring their children in their armes, therefore the Prophets foreſaw the baptiſme of Infants: It is the happineſſe of the beſt arguments to have the weakeſt anſwers; they might be brought to other ends, which he proveth from *Mat.* 19. 15. but were thoſe in that place brought to the Church according to the propheſie? then Chriſt muſt needs be underſtood as ſitting in the Church, and ſuffer them to come to me, muſt be; admit them into the Church, as I have ſaid: it is true, that men which come to the Church, come for other ends then to be baptized, but if baptiſme be the door of the Church, as it is the ſacramentall door of the viſible Church, *nemine contradicente*, beſides Independents, then whatſoever be their buſineſſe, they did come in by the door of baptiſme: And whereas Mr. Tombes ſaith, that was an analogie and was performed by the perſwaſions in which the Gentiles did perſwade their children to imbrace Chriſt: he formerly affirmeth little ones in armes are not to be baptized, becauſe not capable of inſtructions, and muſt bringing of little ones in armes, be interpreted by inſtructions? it is true that Junius doth ſay, *cum vexillo Evangelii quod eſt potentia Dei ad ſalutem, hæc omnia allegorice dicuntur de amplitudine regni Chriſti ſpiritualis*; but he doth not ſay, that bringing of children in armes ſhould be underſtood of grown children, capable of inſtruction, when it may be literally underſtood.

Laſtly, I ſhall only mention that argument, taken out of *Epheſ.* 5. 26. where it is ſaid, Chriſt cleanſed his Church with waſhing of water through the Word: from whence it is argued, that the Church is waſhed with water of baptiſme, or not partaker of the waſhing by the blood of Chriſt. To which Mr. Tombes maketh this anſwer: that if this argument be of force, the thief repenting on the croſſe, Infants, catechumeni, martyrs, and others, dying without baptiſme,

are excluded out of the Church, and the benefit of Christ; he ſhould have ſaid, if none of theſe were capable of baptiſme, then were they excluded from the benefit of Chriſts death, where God doth prevent any by death, the party ſo taken away by God, is not deprived of the benefit of Chriſts death; God is not tied to ſacraments ſo, as that he cannot ſave without them, though contempt of ſacraments be ſinfull and damnable.

Mr. Tombes his ſecond argument is, That which agreeth not with the Lords inſtitution of baptiſme, is deſervedly doubtfull, but the right of Infants baptiſme agreeth not with the Lords inſtitution of baptiſme, *Ergo*.

I deny the minor, Mr. Tombes proveth, becauſe Infants cannot be Diſciples of Chriſt; I ſay they may. Mr. Tombes confeſſeth Infants may be ſanctified, but it cannot be made known to us, that is not Mr. Tombes his argument, that it muſt be known to us that they are ſanctified, neither from the inſtitution doth it appear that they muſt be Diſciples before they are baptized, much leſſe that it muſt appear: The commiſſion to the Apoſtles, and from them to all the Miniſters of the Word to the end of the world, is to make Diſciples of all nations, baptizing and teaching them what Chriſt ſhall command. The parties to be baptized, are all nations, without any reſtriction at all; their commiſſion is, to baptize all nations, and this in reference to that nationall covenant that then was among the Jews, only the publike worſhip was limited to the Temple then, now to no place, make Diſciples, is no limitation of perſons: Their commiſſion was to make all nations Diſciples, which they were to execute, *pro viribus*, to the uttermoſt of their power; the conjunction of baptiſme, and teaching, with making Diſciples, was not with reſpect to any perſonall reſtriction, but it is *conjunctio mediorum ad finem*, make all nations Diſciples; the meaning is, by baptiſme and teaching: Now, the ſetting down of theſe words, making Diſciples; firſt is, becauſe that was the end of their commiſſion firſt, in intention, and muſt firſt be propoſed: as in all operations is neceſſary, as if a man will have an houſe built, a city conquered, an enemy taken; the firſt thing that he propoſeth, is the thing that he will have done, and after directeth, or conſulteth about the means, though they muſt uſe the means before they get the end, I have already ſpoken to this, and ſhall more fully in my arguments that I intend for childrens baptiſme: For, that which Maſter Tombes ſaith, then the children of Infidels might be baptized, I have already ſpoken of, that it is not incapacity of the childe that diſableth him from baptiſme, it is the fault of the parent that will not bring his childe, nor will undertake to bring up his childe in Chriſtian doctrine; (nor is he that is an Infidell, herein to be believed) but in Chriſt, Jewes and Gentiles are all one, and a childe as capable of Chriſtian Religion, (according to his education) though his father be an Heathen, as if a Chriſtian; the reaſon why the ſeed of Abraham had a priviledge, was, the Ordinances were only in his houſe, as many as came to have benefit

rest of the Ordinances, were circumcised, though not of Abrahams seed; they that were bought with money, or sojourned in Abrahams house, nay, though they were reckoned as a family distinct from Abrahams, and the males reckoned not as Abrahams males, but their own males; yet, if they desired to eate the Passeover, their males must be circumcised, *Exod.* 12. 48. Those that joyn themselves to the Ordinances, and claim their interest in baptisme, and relation in Christ, to be his Disciples, they must be baptized, and their families, and as many as they can undertake for, to bring to the outward means, if they can undertake for whole nations, the commissioners may not refuse them: they must be suffered to come, if any will undertake to bring them, though children. Now, that fathers by undertaking to bring their children to hearing and to learning, what is the way of God, do no more then their dutie, and what they can readily perform, and do bring their children to Church, and take order for their catechizing, which (were the parents as carefull as they ought) were a great means to promote Religion and Piety among men, and is often required in the Scripture from the father. That is, by this Anabaptisticall tenet laid only upon the Minister, which turneth into a great incumbrance, and neglect of the instruction of the people, whereby many have been enforced to fall into that inexcusable error that all men have the office of a Minister, if baptized themselves, and have gifts, such as the people shall approve of: But, grant that the nations must be made Disciples, before they must be baptized, and that all nations must believe before Disciples? doth it follow, that every party must believe that is baptized, *quod convenit parti, quæ pars convenit toti gratia ipsius partis*, that which agreeth to any part, agreeth to the whole, by reason of the part; but not to every part? the whole man seeth with his eye (I speak *de actu videndi*) but not with any other member, but having gotten the knowledge by the eye, the soul implieth other members *more imperato*, to do their office: So the Magistrates that are not only the sense, but the understanding of the nations believing may be baptized, and by the duty of their place, require others to be baptized also: *Non quicquid totius etiam partis est, in totis integrantibus*, a man must see before he go into the river to be washed, he seeth with his eye, not with his foot; but when he is washed, his foot may be washed also: the nation believeth by the Magistrate by whose authority the whole nation is put to schoo to Christ, and is baptized, which is an externall duty, and may be required by the Magistrate: as for faith, we have no Lords of faith, here every man must give an account of his faith to the Lord of faith, Jesus Christ, upon his day. In the mean time, it is a most insolent arrogancy, and contrary to Scripture, for any man to judge of anothers faith. Saint Paul saith, not as having dominion over your faith, but as helpers of your joy: 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. and Saint Peter, not as Lords over the flock: if therefore they are not Lords, how come they to be Judges? what do Lordship consist in a name, or in judicature? names

be

be but weake and childish apprehensions of things, natures only yeeld dimme knowledge: Moses could no sooner take upon him to judge of wrong done among brethren, but presently they aske, Who made him a Prince, a Lord, a Judge; insinuating that judgement belongeth to a Lord: Wee doe much declaime against Lordship and dominion over other mens consciences and faith, yet not only Ministers, but every man will take upon him to judge without scruple, this man hath faith, and that man hath none: it is true, charity doth permit men privatly to approve, but not condemne the faith of another: Baptisme is an externall duty, such as man can take notice of whether done or not: and if a man be called to an account whether he hath baptized such a person or not, or whether he went or carried an Infant to be baptized, who baptized him? he may be able to prove these things by humane testimony, and therefore they are of humane cognizance: but who hath faith, and who not, no man breathing can give any testimony thereto, and therefore man cannot judge: But some man will say, the foot doth not see, because not capable for want of organs; but every man is capable of faith, that is not the question, whether all are capable of faith, I mean men of all conditions, but whether faith be of humane cognizance, neither is that argument of any force that faith is necessary to make Baptisme of any efficacie, therefore untill the Ministers are acquainted that the persons to be baptized have faith, they may not baptize them by the same rule, because no humane action can be well done without faith, no humane action can be required of any man by the Civill Magistrate, & so at one blow al humane society is destroied; but man must require all duties of men that they can judge of leaving the inner part of it to the judgement of God, who only can judge the heart: for as the neglect of a duty is sinful, so no sin so great as to enter upon the Prerogatives of God, who only can judge the heart, so that whatsoever is pretended from any speech of beleeving before Baptisme: yet no one place where the profession of faith is required of the person to be baptized.

The third argument is taken from the practice of the Apostles and John the Baptist, which saith he, are the best Expositors of the Institution, but I deny it, the exposition cannot goe before the text, John the Baptist that never lived to see the institution could not expound the words he never heard of: but he affirmeth that baptisme cannot be administred to Infants after the same manner as the Apostles and John the Baptist did administer it; for confirmation whereof he affirmeth that the Jewes did confesse their sinnes before Baptisme, and the Apostles before Baptisme, did require shews of faith and repentance.

First, that they did confesse sins before Baptisme, he proveth out of Mat. 3. 6. they were baptized of John in Jordan confessing their sins: but doth this prove that every particular person did confesse his sinnes to John the Baptist, and that this confession was before Baptisme, or that it was an orall confession? none of all these things are necessarily drawne out of the words; the words are, Jerusalem and

all Judea, and the region round about Jordan were baptized confeſſing their ſinnes. Now I have formerly ſhewed that a Nation, or Country, or City may be ſaid to doe a thing, though the organicall part principall men only doe it. Again, the text ſaith, that they were baptized confeſſing their ſinnes, implying that the ſhew of Baptiſme was a confeſſion of ſinne, as a man that waſheth doth by waſhing confeſſe (though he ſay nothing) that he was defiled, but if an orall confeſſion which the words do not yeeld, yet whether they made their confeſſion before or after baptiſme, is not ſaid, nor can be proved out of the Text; neither can a preſent be drawn from an hiſtoricall narration, that theſe men did confeſſe their ſins, it is as much as it can prove, that it is lawfull for thoſe that can confeſſe their ſins to do; but all that may be baptized muſt confeſſe their ſins, will no way follow: For the ſecond place, *Luke* 3. 10. that is, ſome miſtaken place.

He further affirmeth, that the Apoſtles did require before baptiſme, ſhewes of faith, and repentance, and citeth many places out of the Acts; whereas not one place that he citeth, proveth any ſuch thing, that the Apoſtles did require any man to make any ſhew of his faith, or repentance before baptiſme; it is true, they teach men to believe and repent, but not take any account, or require them, or any perſon to give any account to any Miniſter before they were baptized, let that be proved, and the buſineſſe is ended, to uſe his phraſe; but, to give a full anſwer to all that can be alledged of that kinde from Scripture, I ſay, that the Apoſtles did indeed preach faith, repentance, and baptiſme altogether, but whatſoever was ſaid of faith and repentance, in reference to baptiſme, was either doctrinall, or hiſtoricall; what was doctrinall, was without any implication of account to be given, otherwiſe then to God; we can preach faith, but take no account of it: what is hiſtorically related of faith, and repentance, cannot imply any confeſſion or manifeſtation, otherwiſe then in the very act of baptiſme it ſelf, ſeeing it was impoſſible for the Apoſtles to baptize nations, and countries, and cities, if no credence had been given to the doctrine of baptiſme; ſo that their declaration that they believed and were baptized, might well be related by the hiſtorian, though nothing were intended but that, that they were baptized: For, when Hiſtorians relate any fact done, they take liberty to obſerve the neceſſary motives and circumſtances of the fact, without any other implication, then that the fact was done; nay, had not the Holy Ghoſt mentioned any beleeving at all, but only ſaid that they were baptized, we might have inferred from the fact, without raſhneſſe, that if Peter, or Paul, or any of the Apoſtles did baptize, them that Judea, Jeruſalem, that is, the prevailing party did beleeve, that there was ſome kinde of credit given to their doctrine, that they did believe there was ſome kinde of good or benefit that was like to come of baptiſme, or otherwiſe they would not have endured one or two men to have baptized them, but that a profeſſion of faith in a catecheticall way, whereof the Apoſtles did, and of duty ought

to take account, that is not said; I hope, to make appear on just occasion was not done.

The fourth argument is taken from the next age immediately succeeding the Apostles; what is said concerning that point, is not argumentative, it dependeth only upon humane testimony, and men that give testimony thereto, are partially related where their testimony is agreed upon, that they did say so, as they are reported, yet their credit is questioned by him that disliketh their saying; sometimes that part of the work, out of which any thing is alledged, is proclaimed spurious, and that very author that we are content to alledge, with honour, when he speaketh for us, him we bespatter and vilifie, when against us; so that what can be said of this kind, savoreth rather of affection, ostentation of reading, then of argument, and yeeldeth matter of concertation, rather then satisfaction; and therefore I leave the Reader that desireth to know more of this matter, to Dr. Holmes, and others, that may wrestle with Mr. Tombes in this point, my resolution being only to deal with him in such things as may carry shews of argument out of Scripture, and so I come to the next argument.

The first argument is of the same nature with this, that the ages that did use baptisme, took it upon wrong principles, as a tradition and imitation of Jewish circumcision, without universall practice, mixed with other errors. Among Apostolicall traditions, many were vainly reported and taken up to countenance severall errors, as delivered from the Apostles; if some have disclaimed the proof of Scripture for childrens baptisme, and held it notwithstanding lawfull from weaker grounds, that doth not any way weaken the authority of Scripture, and strength of reason taken from thence. If any one hath proved baptisme lawfull from Apostolicall tradition, that doth not hinder me, or any other from proving it lawfull by Scripture, neither doth the mixing it with errors in the same person, make the baptisme of Infants erroneous, if so, all truths would quickly be turned into errors, seeing few men have been without their slips, which yet have not only held, but defended and propagated with admiration many pretious truths: Mr. Tombes would be loth, if his Anabaptisme be convicted erroneous, that all that he hath, or shall hereafter speak, should be therefore reputed erroneous: by the same reason, all the truths that were taught among Papists, are *eo nomine* erroneous, because they taught them; and so not only the doctrine of the Trinity, but the incarnation of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, were therefore erroneous, because those that held these things, held likewise many other heresies, and so his tenth argument is likewise answered.

His 6, 7, 8, and 9. arguments, are so neer alike, and all to little purpose, that I had thought wholly to have omitted them, but that men would have given some other construction then that they were weak, and therefore omitted, I shall therefore say something of them, lest men willing to be deceived, should place strength, where indeed there is none. He

He telleth us in his ſixth argument, that Infants baptiſme hath cauſed many inventions to ſupport it, and hath occaſioned defect in Church policy, but proveth none of that which he ſaith: he only affirmeth, that Infants-baptiſme was ſupported by ſureties and Epiſcopall confirmation; and that it brought in Church-covenant as a preparation to the Lords Supper, for abuſes that may creep in with any duty, they do not take away the goodneſſe or lawfulneſſe of the duty it ſelf.

His ſeventh argument accuſeth baptiſme of Infants, with four errors: Firſt, that baptiſme conferreth grace by the work done: The ſecond is regeneration: The third, Infants dying are ſaved by the faith done: The fourth, regenerate perſons may fall from grace.

To theſe two arguments, I plainly ſay, that none of all theſe things are occaſioned by Infants baptiſme, or if ſo, men may not doubt of the goodneſſe of all ſuch things as wicked men may, or will take occaſion to be offended at: for then Chriſt and the Goſpel ſhould be principally queſtioned, the great ſtumbling ſtone and rock of offence; ſo that occaſion of offence is an argument, rather of goodneſſe then of fault, Satan being moſt ready to entice us to corrupt our beſt actions.

What, doth baptizing Infants imply the conferring of grace by the work done? nay, we ſay of Baptiſme, as Saint Paul of circumciſion, that is, not baptiſme that is outward in the ceremony, but that which is of the heart; but the praiſe of that is not of man, but of God: we cannot praiſe men for baptiſme of the heart, God baptizeth, ſeeth, judgeth the heart, we baptiſe the body, but leave the reſidue to God only; in ſteed of Chriſt, we teach thoſe children that by their parents are brought to be enrolled the diſciples of Chriſt, the things that Chriſt hath commanded us, and tell the baptized, when they come to be catechiſed, that they muſt have the effect of their baptiſme by faith in Chriſt, and not by the work done. What Mr. Tombes, are all Pedobaptiſts Papiſts? theſe are ſtrange calumnies, and why muſt Infants baptiſme neceſſarily imply, that the regenerate may fall away from grace? can none of your baptized perſons that are baptized being of full yeers fall away from the effect and benefit of their baptiſme? if that be not an hereſie, that ſuch men as are judged believers by your Miniſters, and ſo adjudged fit for baptiſme, and baptized, cannot ever after fall away from grace, I know not what is. I hope Religion and knowledge of God, is not brought to that outward formality that all ſhould conſiſt in your humane judicature. it ſeems, Mr. Tombes, when he baptizeth any he will promiſe the parties he baptizeth, that they ſhall never fall from grace. I have heard many ignorant people uſe this argument, but that Mr. Tombes, a man cried up for learning, ſhould uſe ſuch an argument, is admirable and ſtrange to me; and certainly, by this Mr. Tombes doth plainly confute himſelf guilty of that opinion, that baptiſme doth conferre grace by the work done: For he inferreth, that if children may be baptized in Infancy, then men may fall away from grace, becauſe many, not withſtanding their

baptiſme, become wicked afterward, doth not this imply, that if they were baptized, they were gracious? if baptiſme do not conferre grace by the work done, how can it be inferred, that ſuch men, as after baptiſme turn wicked, do fall away from grace? Saint Paul, ſpeaking of falſe teachers, 1 *Joh.* 2. 19. ſaith of them, they went from us, becauſe they were not of us: not that they fell away from grace, but they deſerted the profeſſion, becauſe they were not gracious: but, ſaith Mr. Tombes, if baptiſme be adminiſtred to Infants, and they walk not according to their profeſſion, they fall from grace, no ſuch matter unleſſe Mr. Tombes will ſay, baptiſme cannot be adminiſtred but to the gracious, they fall from baptiſme, and ſo will many that Mr. Tombes, or any the moſt diſcerning of them all, notwithſtanding all the caution that can be taken, or elſe it were a moſt happy caſe to come under their hands which cannot be imagined, unleſſe it flow from the operation of the work done, ſome of them that paſſe their examination will undoubtedly be unfaithull, or at leaſt may be ſuch, for ought they can do to prevent it; ſo that if they do deceive them and obtain baptiſme, then baptiſme muſt conferre the grace, or they may remain ungracious ſtill; and ſo notwithſtanding their baptiſme, they cannot be ſaid to fall away from grace which they never had, though they ſhould renounce their baptiſme, muchleſſe by not walking anſwerable to the profeſſion into which they are baptized, or not behaving themſelves as Diſciples ought to do.

The eighth Argument is taken from this, That baptiſme of Infants hath cauſed many faults and abuſes in diſcipline, worſhip, and converſation; this is likewiſe only ſaid, nothing proved in it, he reckoneth ten of theſe: Firſt, private baptiſme: Secondly, baptiſme by women: Thirdly, of unborn Infants: Fourthly, Baptizing Infants of uncertain progeny: Fifthly, they that are baptized in the the name of the Lord, know not the Lord: Sixthly, it hath brought in the admiſſion of ignorant and prophane perſons into the Church, and unto the Lords Supper; for who can deny rightly the right of the Church to the baptized? Seventhly, it perverteth the order of diſcipline; that firſt a man be baptized, and after among the catechiſed: Eighthly, the ſacrament of baptiſme is turned into a prophane meeting to feaſt together. Ninthly, men forget baptiſme; ſo that it hath the force of a carnall right, and not a ſpirituall inſtitution: Tenthly, it taketh away, or at leaſt diminiſheth the zeal and induſtry of knowing the Goſpell: But, be all theſe faults? and are all of theſe flowing from Infants baptiſme?

Firſt, I ſhall ſhew, that many of theſe have no affinity at all with Infants baptiſme. Firſt, private baptiſme hath nothing to do with Infants baptiſme; for that Infants may be baptized publikely; nay, Lawes may be made, requiring their publike baptiſme, though Infants; nay, the Directory is at this time ſo penned, and in all times publike baptiſme was principally aimed at and deſired; and for the moſt part ſo performed; what he meaneth by private baptiſme, I do

not

not know; baptiſme in an houſe among ſo many as make a congregation, I cannot diſcerne how that can well be accounted any ſuch fault: I am ſure he hath not proved it.

2. He telleth us that baptizing of Infants hath brought in the baptizing by women, as though Miniſters may not baptize children as well as women.

3. The baptizing of Infants hath brought in the baptizing of children not brought to light: for my part, I can ſay nothing, but wonder at ſuch an inference.

4. As for baptizing of children of uncertaine progenie; I know nothing of it, but that if any man that is a Chriſtian himſelfe will undertake to bring him up a Diſciple of Chriſts, ſuch a childe may be baptized.

5. They are baptized in the name of the Lord that know not the Lord: what inconvenience from that? It is true, St. Paul ſaith, No man can call upon him of whom he hath not heard: It would indeed put on the forme of ſome probablity (if it were referred unto the perſon that did call on the name of the Lord) that it were ſomething abſurd: but doth it follow, becauſe no man can call on him of whom he hath not heard; therefore he cannot call on the name of God in the behalfe of any but ſuch as have heard of God? none can pray but thoſe that have faith: but may not a faithfull man pray for an Infidell? may not a Chriſtian parent pray for his childe, becauſe the childe doth not know the Lord? this were very ſtrange: as for the childs conſent, I ſay ſo farre as concernes the Covenant between God and man which is ſealed in Baptiſme, conſent is not required on our part to the obligation: we are bound to obedience, and are under the ſanction of condemnation if we conſent not: and this is the very reaſon why circumciſion which had as great a reſpect to the circumciſion of the heart as baptiſme, was a vaine, and nothing without faith as baptiſme was, yet ſtamped on the infants of the Jewes, wherein the Scripture is not ſilent; therefore this argument is not of any force that baptiſme is not to be adminiſtred to Infants, becauſe they doe not conſent, unleſſe the conſent of the party to be baptized were required to the obligation: if the childe were free from thoſe duties unto which he is tyed by his baptiſme untill he had conſented thereunto, it were a great wrong to baptize him and thereby lay a yoke upon him without his conſent, from which he were otherwiſe free; but whether he conſent or not, the obligation of obedience and faith lyeth on him, and the ſanction of wrath and condemnation attendeth on the Infidell and diſobedient whether they conſent or not, whether they are baptized or not; ſo that conſent both to obedience, and faith, and baptiſme; whether baptiſme be repreſented to them as already done, or to be done, is required of him that is *adultus* or of yeares, as a duty, not as liberty; the refuſing to conſent is a ſinne and puniſhable both by God and man, though theſe conſiſt much inwternalls, of which only God can judge and puniſh: faith and obedience

of the heart; but as for the externalls of Gods worſhip, ſuch as are the externall rite of baptiſme that is to be performed in the ſight of men, and men may require him that is of yeares to conſent to his baptiſme, laying the neglect on him as a ſinne, and puniſhing him for it as for adultery, fornication, or any other publike offence, leaving the matter of faith which is private, to the judgement of God: ſo likewiſe may the Nations receive baptiſme for the whole, as all other externalls, requiring parents to bring their children as before: I have thought good to ſpeake ſomething to this point, becauſe it ſeemeth to carry ſome ſhew of reaſon with it, that no man ſhould be tyed to a Covenant unto which hee never gave any conſent, which in free covenants is true, though in publike covenants we are tyed by the covenants of our Anceſtors, and are bound by thoſe lawes wee are borne under, made by the conſent of our parents; but in the caſe between God and us, he made us, and giveth lawes to us, under which we muſt live or dye (I take Lawes here in a generall ſenſe to ſignifie direction for faith and repentance, as well as any other rules of life) not by vertue of our owne conſent, but Gods abſolute right and authority.

6. Mr. Tombs telleth us, that baptizing of Infants hath brought the admiſſion of ignorant and prophane perſons unto the communion of the Church, and to the Lords Supper; for who can deny rightly the rite of the Church to the baptized? ſo he.

To this I anſwer, that the engagement of the parent, to inſtruct his childe (which is but his duty) will certainly be a great meanes to ſet men upon the performance of their duty therein, when men ſhall ſolemnly in the preſence of God before a congregation be charged with the bringing up of their children in the feare of God, that they muſt looke to their owne converſation that it be exemplary to their children; if this be not performed by the parents, yet the charging it upon them out of Gods word, cannot but be a meanes rather to keep out ignorance and prophaneneſſe then to bring them in; can any means be uſed by man more available then to inſtruct children in their tender years in the knowledge of God? Certainly God hath informed us, that this is the moſt laſting knowledge that wee learned in tender yeares, and our experience doth abundantly confirme this. Now what greater care can bee had by the Church then in ſuch a ſolemne and ſacramentall manner for a man to bee charged with the education of his childe as a Scholler of Chriſt, as ſoon as he is able to learne any thing? if this be a way to introduce prophaneneſſe and ignorance, I know not what can keep it out; but he implyeth as a great ſinne, that ignorant perſons ſhould be admitted into communion of the Church, and the Lords Supper; for this admittance into the communion of the Church, if any thing may be argued from thence touching the unlawfulneſſe of Infants baptiſme, a juſt and due tract ought to be inſtituted, wherein the whole queſtion muſt be ſtated; what is meant by com-

communion of the Church, whether he underſtand the viſible or inviſible Church, whoſe office it is to admit, and whoſe to ſhut out of the Churches communion? what be the rites of a viſible and what of an inviſible Church? how can the Infant come and demand the Lords Supper, which he diſtinguiſheth from the communion of the Church (but how I cannot tell) untill they be inſtructed to know the Lords body to remember the death of Chriſt, and examine themſelves, which they are commanded to doe, and then eat? but where is the Miniſter commanded to give the Sacrament to all that are in the Church, or elſe to turne them out of the Church? theſe things muſt be proved plainly, or elſe otherwiſe the argument drawne from hence againſt childrens baptiſme is *ab ignotioribus*: Chriſt giveth you a charge to baptize all Nations: you ſay nay: we ſhall then let in ignorant and prophane perſons into the Church; you will not baptize any untill they be fit to receive the Sacrament: you were as good ſay, you will make commiſſions your ſelves: Chriſt bids baptize and teach: you ſay there is more in the matter then ſo: you will baptize when you pleaſe, and whom you pleaſe, they that will bee baptized muſt paſſe your cenſure, and ſtay your leaſure.

Chriſt bids you teach, and ſo much examination as is needfull for teaching may be deduced from thence: but did God give you in charge to admit and refuſe, and give you any rules by which ye might walke in the diſcharge of this duty? if ſo, ye might then juſtly plead this right, and make that an argument to remove all that ſtandeth in its way. But I wonder extremely at the intemperate zeale of thoſe that plead the duty of admitting and refuſing of men *ex officio* from and to baptiſme, and the Lords Supper; and herein the Lords Supper is the moſt cryed up priviledge which you here fall upon (whether out of your owne opinion as it ſeems by ſome is ſuſpected, or to confute your adverſaries) and make this as a medium to prove that Infants may not be baptized, becauſe none may be admitted to the Lords Supper that are wicked; though for my part I doe not underſtand the conſequence how baptizing infants and charging their parents to bring them up in the fear of God would be a means to cheriſh and foſter up ignorance and ſin. But here men cry out againſt liberty to come to the Lords Supper, as if that would pollute the Sacrament, and countenance ſin; as though men might not have liberty to come to the Lords Supper upon their own examination, and yet might juſtly be puniſhed for their ſins when they can be proved againſt them: may not men make choice of their owne habitations and drinke when they pleaſe, and yet be juſtly puniſhed for adultery and drunkenneſſe? I do not know but the Magiſtrate may ſuppreſſe and puniſh ſin, though men may be allowed their liberty to receive Sacraments: For my part, I wiſh ſome ſtricter courſe were taken with ſin.

The ſeventh fault laid to the charge of Infants baptiſme, is that, it perverts the order of diſcipline, that firſt a man be baptized, and after among the catechized; but who I pray you, Mr. Tombes did lay downe this for an order of Diſcipline? it

ſeems

ſeems Sacraments are ſubſervient principally to Diſcipline: I had thought the uſe of Sacraments had been for confirmation of doctrine.

But let us once heare where this diſcipline is, what footſteps in the doctrine or practice of Chriſt and his Apoſtles: As for the practice of the Apoſtles, there is nothing found but converſion, and baptizing, without any interpoſition of time: that of *Matth.* 3. 5, 6. there Jeruſalem, Judea, and all the region round about Jordan, came to John the Baptiſt, and were baptized of him; as like *Acts* 2. no catechiſing either of theſe perſons: if ever they meant to know Chriſt, muſt be catechiſed after their baptiſme, or not at all; I underſtand not any ſuch duty of catechiſing, if not comprehended in the duty of teaching; and doth this ſeem a thing ſo ſtrange to you, that men ſhould be taught after they are baptized? What? may not men be taught after they have bargained to be diſciples? This is all one, as if a man ſhould bargain with a School-maſter, that his ſon ſhould be his ſcholler, and from that day forward, the School-maſter ſhould never teach him; but this rather dependeth upon the uſe of the Ancients, then authority of the Word.

The three laſt confute themſelves; as for recrimination, I ſee the Anabaptiſts ſo ſoundly paid with abuſes and faults, that have been laid to their charges by others, that I ſhall not meddle with them in this point, *uſus per ſe, abuſus per accidens.*

The ninth Reaſon, that which cauſeth unneceſſary diſputes, that cannot be determined by any certain rule, that is deſervedly doubtfull: but the tenet of Infants baptiſme is ſuch. All theſe diſputes are determined by a certain rule; when the commiſſion plainly chargeth the Miniſters to baptize all the world, ſo as they can make them diſciples, if any will undertake to bring them up in the fear of God, and inſtruction of the Goſpel: or they of yeers do undertake for themſelves ſubmiſſion to the Goſpel, they may be baptized, this is the rule of the Word: Abraham had not only right to circumciſe his own children, but he might buy a childe and circumciſe it; nay, if he bought it, he muſt circumciſe it.

But grant that they muſt be taught firſt, tell me how will Mr. Tombes ſatisfie the doubts that may ariſe from hence? how much they muſt learn firſt, how long they muſt be catechumeni? ſecondly, who muſt judge of their ſufficiency? thirdly, what if any ſhould baptize them before they were fit? whether that muſt be accounted a void act, and the party put again among the catechumeni? fourthly, whether, if this accounted valid, whether the party that was baptized before he were ſufficiently catechized, muſt for ever after remain ignorant? together with many other of the like nature, which I ſhall put among my reaſons for childrens baptiſme.

The tenth Reaſon is the ſame with the firſt, only there he handleth *accidens ſine ſubjecto*, here *in ſubjecto*; there he ſaith, it was mixed with other errors: here, that thoſe that held Infants baptiſme, held other errors; therefore I conceive that already anſwered.

The

The eleventh, Pedobaptiſts agree not among themſelves, when Anabaptiſts do this, may be an Argument, not till then; and yet anſwerable, that men may ſooner agree in evill then good, as ariſing from a more common principle.

And now I am at laſt come to his laſt Reaſon, and that a weighty one, ſaith Mr. Tombes: But it is taken only from a ſeeming effect of Infants baptiſme; if there be any weight in an Argument, from an effect, that is, *ab effectu, proximo, & ſuo*; but this doth but ſeem to take away one end, and, perhaps, the primary end of baptiſme; that it ſhould be a ſigne the baptized ſheweth himſelf a diſciple, and confeſſeth the faith. Mr. Tombes telleth us, that many things argue, that it ſhould be ſuch a ſigne, but keepeth his arguments to himſelf; for my part, I know none, I know nothing charged upon the party to be baptized, as a preparation to his baptiſme: as for profeſſion of faith, that is no where required; its true, Philip did teach the Eunuch baptiſme, and faith, but profeſſion of faith he taught him not: It is likewiſe true that St. Luke doth hiſtorically relate, that the Eunuch did confeſſe his faith, but of this before.

But Mr. Tombes doth prove that men muſt confeſſe their faith before baptiſme, becauſe baptiſme is a ſigne that the baptized ſheweth himſelf a diſciple, and confeſſeth himſelf a diſciple. To this, I firſt ſay, that baptiſme may be a ſigne of profeſſion, but not a ſacramentall ſigne: A ſacramentall ſigne is to ſignifie what Chriſt hath ſet it to ſignifie, namely, food and nouriſhment; this is the end of a ſacrament, to lead our infirmities to the apprehenſion of the great things of God; to comprehend the vertue and efficacy of the body and blood of Chriſt, the participation of the fulneſſe of Chriſt, to lead our faith by the authority of God, to the apprehenſion of the things of God. It is true, out duty is annexed to receiving of ſacraments, whereunto we are bound by vertue of the command of Chriſt; but the ſignification of the ſacrament is not in our duty, but in Gods mercy; were not our duty converſant about an incomprehenſible object, we ſhould have had no need of ſacraments: But, for Mr. Tombes to deny ſacraments to be viſible ſignes of grace, without giving any reaſon for it, when St. Luke doth plainly tell us, that baptiſme doth waſh away ſin, *Acts* 22, 16. ariſe and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſin: and St. Paul doth tell us plainly, that the bread which we break, is the communion of the body of Chriſt, ſhewing that it is a diſtribution of the body of Chriſt; communication is properly, *ſuperiorum ad inferiora*; I remember I have read in Ariſt. Topic. *lib.* 4. *cap.* 1. *Partic.* 6. Keck. *lib.* 1. 72. that *participare eſt ſuſcipere ejus quod communicatur definitionem*; and Keckerman in the quoted place ſaith, *effective ind vidua, multa communicant: ut ignis calorem ſuo*; where you ſee, that communication is ſtill rendred by giving the whole nature and definitions as *in univerſali*, or in exciting *qualitatem ſimilarem*, a like quality in another body; whereby it muſt appear, that Chriſt in the ſacrament, doth communicate or diſtribute ſome grace among us: as for our duties, that by

vertue of the command are annexed to the receiving of the ſacrament, thoſe are externall to the nature of the ſacrament, though neceſſary to the efficacy thereof unto us: This muſt needs be a declining cauſe, that enforceth the ſtrongeſt patron of it in its defence, to deny the nature of a ſacrament.

But ſee further: Mr. Tombes ſaith, that baptiſme is a ſigne of profeſſion. Profeſſion is taken popularly and materially for the Art or Trade that is profeſſed, and then men may be ſaid to wear ſome badge or ſigne of his profeſſion; otherwiſe, in a proper and ſtrict ſenſe, Profeſſion is nothing elſe, but a ſigne of ſomething in the heart or minde of him that doth profeſſe; ſo that profeſſion of our faith is but a ſigne of our faith, and a ſigne of that profeſsion is but a ſigne of a ſigne; nay, profeſſion it ſelf is more manifeſt then any ſacrament can be, and therefore needeth no ſigne; but grant it were the ſigne of our profeſſion, what were that to prove that profeſsion muſt be before baptiſme? ſure, *ſignum & ſignatum* be *ſimul natura*, the ſigne and thing ſignified, are of the ſame continuance, one cannot be before another: Here is in this argument another circumſtance; that baptiſme is frequently put for doctrine: therefore doctrine muſt go before baptiſme, nay rather, then baptiſme doth teach: for that which is any where tranſlated metaphorically, muſt have reſemblance with the primitive ſignification: as if a man ſhall call his ſon the ſtaffe of his age, the ſon muſt ſuſtain his father in his feeble condition: though I do not know how any of thoſe places do prove any ſuch thing, that baptiſme is taken for doctrine, otherwiſe then materially, as in *Acts* 10.37. John is ſaid to preach baptiſme: ſo is he ſaid to preach repentance. As for Mr. Tombes Argument from witchcraft, which he confuteth, I leave every judicious Reader to think what he pleaſeth, as not being worthy the conſideration of a Divine; and thus I conceive Mr. Tombs Argument anſwered. I come now at laſt, to mine own Arguments for Infants baptiſme.

Thoſe that in mans judgement ought to be eſteemed fit for the kingdome of God, are by man to be admitted to the priviledges of the kingdome, *viz.* baptiſme; but all Infants in mans judgement are to be eſteemed fit for the kingdome of God, therefore all Infants muſt be admittted to the priviledges of the kingdome, *Matth.* 19.13.

I have already diſcuſſed this point, Chriſt findeth fault with his Diſciples, for not ſuffering little children to come, and ſaith not, I know theſe are of the kingdome of God; but telleth his Diſciples, not only they, that were brought, but ſuch as they, and that not only ſuch as they in his eſtimation, but their view, otherwiſe there had been no ground of a rebuke, but commendation; rebukes be inſtructions for the time to come, at leaſt, it is not well done; do ſo no more, when you ſee any ſuch as theſe are, ſuffer them, and forbid them not. You ſee the precept for the future is generall, men do not uſe to reprove but to the purpoſe, that the thing reproved be no more done; therefore the Diſciples were to eſtimate

mate not them only, but ſuch as they were (and that in an aſſigned likneſſe, namely, in that they were little children) as fit for the kingdome of God, and upon that ground ſuffer them to come to Chriſt. If theſe and the like had only been fit for the kingdome of God in the eſtimation of Chriſt by his omniſcience, here had not been matter of reproof, but commendation: Chriſt would then have ſaid rather, ye did well to forbid the little children to come to me, for you did not know whether the kingdome of God did belong to them; neither can I give you any direction concerning other children for the time to come, becauſe you cannot tell to whom the kingdome of heaven doth belong; however, let theſe come; for I know the kingdome of heaven doth belong to them, and ſuch elect children as theſe are; but ye ſee Chriſt doth rebuke them, and thereby giveth them directions for the time to come, which he could not have done, if the likeneſſe had been a ſecret, and things only known to God.

But here Mr. Tombes and Mr. Blackwell, and others, will tell me, by this rule, Turks children, and Infidels may be brought to baptiſme. If any will bring them, and aſſume the inſtruction of them in the doctrine of the Goſpel, I know not but they may: and if Turks would part with their children to Chriſtians, I think it were a very charitable thing ſo to do: For, the promiſe was never ſo tied to Abrahams loynes, neither for ought I know, to any believers, but to education in the family of Abraham, or any other believing family.

But they will further ſay then, by the ſame reaſon are they to be admitted to other benefits, namely, to hearing of the Word, and the other ſacrament: Anſw. I ſay, they are admitted to the reſidue of the Oracles of God, as ſoon as nature or grace do make them fit for them, they may have right before they can uſe them: they are firſt admitted to come to Chriſt for a bleſſing, before they are capable of inſtruction: and preparation for the ſacrament of the Lords Supper, is charged as a duty, which is no where charged on the parties to be baptized.

2. That Sacrament, that requireth no preparation in the ſubject, is to be adminiſtred to every ſubject; but baptiſme is a ſacrament to be adminiſtred without any preparation in the ſubject, therefore baptiſme is to be adminiſtred to every ſubject, every perſon, all nations.

That Sacrament that in the ſigne and ſignification, is preparative to all other grace that is to be adminiſtred without any preparation of the ſubject: but baptiſme in the ſigne and ſignification is preparative to all other grace, therefore it is to be adminiſtred without any preparation: the major is true, or otherwiſe there would a proceſſe in *infinitum*; if that which were preparative to all other graces ſhould have preparations to that, and that muſt have other preparations; and ſo in *infinitum*. The minor I ſhall prove out of Scripture, and plain reaſon drawn from then: *Gal.* 3. 27. as many as are baptized into Chriſt, have put on Chriſt: This doth probably prove, that men that are baptized, are baptized

into Christ, which could not be affirmed, if they were in Christ before baptisme; they could not be said to be baptized into Chist, if they had been in Christ before, which, if faith and repentance must be manifest before baptisme must be affirmed, he that believeth and is penitent is in Christ without doubt.

Object. But some men will say, may not man believe before baptisme?

Reply. I answer no, he cannot, untill Christ baptise him with the Holy Ghost. Now, Christ baptizeth when he pleaseth, either before, in, or after ministeriall baptisme.

Object. But, if Christ hath baptized him before, what need the Minister baptize him?

Reply. Christs baptisme is not known to the Minister, whatsoever confession of faith is made, he must therefore baptize, in obedience to the command of Christ, and leave the baptisme of Christ to him.

How would the Anabaptists insult in the cleerneſse of such a text? And here I cannot but note a notable subtilty of the Anabaptists, I will not say how common with other heretiques, when they have cited a Text, and put a glosse upon it without any respect to the argument of the place, they presently cry the Scripture is all ours, crying down all the labours of the learned that is spent, though never so truly and piously. For the cleering of the Text, that is, Tongues, that is Art: gives us Scripture; we have the Scripture, and then we can carry away the people, take heed that no man spoile you through Philosophy and vain deceit, and this shall serve their turn, to answer all they understand not. If a man tell them that Philosophy is conversant about nature, and such things of reason as are too low for the things of faith, and therefore have principles contrary to doctrine of faith, as out of nothing, nothing is made; and therefore make the first matter eternall, contrary to the doctrine of the creation, from a privation to an habite, no return, that which is dead cannot live again, contrary to the resurrection: but Logick is without any matter of its own, but teacheth men only how to find out the truth of any discourse, written or spoken. Oh, then Logick is nothing but falacies, and herein many schollers concurre with them to hide their own ignorance, whereas indeed, falacies be no part of Logick, unlesse you will say, no reason is reason: it is true, Logicians do mention falacies, as a man may teach a young workman what faults he may commit, whence some ignorant man may affirm, that the skill of such a trade was only in faults, as these do, who only count Logick falacies; and here they have such fooleries, to make the world believe, that reason was an Asse to their fancy, that men may wonder at them, they can shew how foolish a thing Logick is, they can prove a sheep have eight legs, two before, and two behind; two on the right side, and two on the left. My Logick can do more then his, and yet we shall be both fools if we want Logick, to know this is no Logick: First, I can prove a sheep hath sixteen legs, by setting him between four men, one

before

before the ſheep, the other behinde him, and on each ſide one; this ſheep will have four legs before one man, and four behinde, *&c.* which make ſixteen, for relatives have no abſolute nature: before and behind, may be the ſame thing in different reſpects, the ſame foot is before, and on the right or left ſide: this Logick can diſcover well enough, without the help of a fool to flout at that he knoweth not. I impute not this to Mr. Tombes, but to the ignorant, that cry, all is their own by ſuch a wile as this, as though none did regard Scripture but they, and all the Scriptures were cleerly theirs, what was ſpoken againſt them, was againſt Scripture, ſet by humane authority and tradition.

Firſt, in the ſigne it is preparative to all purity, it is waſhing ſo much faith as muſt cauſe men of yeares to ſubmit to baptiſme is neceſſary, without which the Apoſtles could not have baptized; but faith and repentance whereby the heart ſhould be purged, that thoſe muſt be had before the party may be baptized, is an evacuation of the ſigne, and fruſtrateth the ſignification: it cannot be denyed that faith and repentance are required to the efficacie of baptiſme, but ſubſequent to the Sacrament, the water doth ſacramentally waſh away ſinnes: ſo Ananias Act. 22. 16. ſaith to Paul, Why tarrieſt thou, ariſe and be baptized, and waſh away thy ſinnes? Now waſhing doth ſuppoſe nothing in the ſubject but foulneſſe, the bloud of Chriſt cleanſeth us from all ſinne, 1 John 1. 7. all the vertue of the purgation is in the bloud of Chriſt. Now can any man ſay that the bloud of Chriſt cannot purge unleſſe the party be purged before? if faith and repentance were required before baptiſme, then baptiſme could not offer the bloud of Chriſt to purge ſinne, becauſe the party were cleanſed before baptiſme, then Ananias could not have ſaid, Be baptized and waſh away thy ſinne; but waſh thy ſinne firſt, and then be baptized. Act. 15. 9. St. Peter ſheweth that faith doth purifie the heart. Now it is true, faith doth receive the Word and Sacraments, and maketh one and the other effectuall; but both Word and Sacrament doe propoſe Chriſt, the Word to the eare, Sacrament to other ſenſes: Baptiſme doth repreſent the bloud of Chriſt waſhing, and ſenſe doth looke on the waſhing of water, and faith on the promiſe annexed. Now as the word is propoſed to the eare, ſo water is tendred, and the body waſhed with water; whence faith doth collect the purgation of the ſoul from the teſtimony of God; water is no more the immediate object of faith then the word; it is the authority of God in the word that is the object of faith, as likewiſe the bloud of Chriſt in baptiſme; they that beleeve, and they that beleeve not, heare the word, and it is no prophanation of the word to preach it to an Infidell, neither is it any prophanation of baptiſme to baptize an Infidell; yet it is hard to make him heare patiently that in no meaſure doth beleeve unleſſe miracles, or in defect of them ſome aſſiſtance of the Civill Magiſtrate doe concurre; ſo that baptiſme is but an offering of the purgation by the bloud of Chriſt to the eye and the body, as the word doth to the eare, and may be tendered as the

word to all Nations, the power of the one and the other is by faith in Christ conveyed unto us in the ſacrament of baptiſme or the word: baptiſme cannot worke as baptiſme till after adminiſtration, whatſoever is ſaid of it before is but the operation of the word; the waſhing of water doth ſacramentally ſtrengthen our faith: no duty of preparation charged on any, no man ever reprehended for receiving baptiſme unworthily; though the Miniſter hath baptiſme charged on him as part of his duty, yet never any caution given to Miniſters in generall, or to Titus or Timothy to take heed that they baptize no unworthy perſons; nor any ſinne or puniſhment charged on any Miniſter for baptizing any raſhly or without due examination; no precept concerning any difference, but baptize and teach all Nations to the end that they may become the Diſciples of Chriſt. Now where no Law is, there is no tranſgreſſion; where God doth not charge ſinne, how dare any mortall man ſay this or that is ſinfull? if any preparation be required let the Scripture bee ſhewed where that was taught, where baptiſme was deferred till any competent preparation were manifeſt? what Scripture is directed to the catechumeni; nay what one ſentence of Scripture is applicable to them, that is not applicable to Chriſtians at all times, as well after as before baptiſme? Baptiſme is a religious rite which men are eaſily perſwaded out of principles of nature to embrace, as may be ſeen in all Idolatrous worſhips; they have their religious rites which they are perſwaded come from the appointment of their gods, upon which ground they receive them. Now that God did appoint baptiſme is no abuſe, and ſo we muſt tender it to Nations by the appointment of Chriſt, which though they receive but as an Infidell doth the word; yet when faith commeth they make uſe of it. Therefore the Apoſtles argue to move newneſſe of life from baptiſme already received. So Romans 6. 3.4,5. St. Paul argueth what uſe we ſhould make of our baptiſme; namely, that wee ſhould riſe with Chriſt; but though the moſt noble way of arguing be from cauſes, and therefore in the Sacrament of the Lords ſupper, where the worthy receiving of that doth depend on an antecedent cauſe; there faith is ſaid to obtaine the whole vertue of the worke. Joh. 6. 35. I am the bread, he that commeth to me ſhall never hunger, and he that beleeveth on me ſhall never thirſt, v. 47. He that beleeveth hath everlaſting life, 51. Hee that eateth of this bread ſhall live for ever: Whereby he plainly ſaith, That he that beleeveth eateth my fleſh, this bread which is my fleſh ſacramentally, and made ſuch to me by faith. Never any ſuch doctrine as this, he that beleeveth is baptized, becauſe no doctrine is extant precedent to baptiſme in reference to the Gentiles. See all the Epiſtles to the Rom. Corinthians, and the reſidue, all are written to Churches already baptized. Paul declared the whole counſell of God, and yet not one word what ſhould be the carriage of the Catechumeni, or the Miniſters towards them, as if he ſhould ſuppoſe none under the right of the Goſpell that will not firſt bee baptized, and received by the commandement of Chriſt:

Chriſt: ſo he that will teach any thing in St. Pauls Epiſtles, they muſt teach them to the baptized to whom they are directed; as for the Catechumeni, nothing is written or directed either to them or concerning them. As for thoſe hiſtories of the Acts, the greater part were Jews in Covenant with God already; unto whom Peter did indeed preach repentance in reference to that bloud that they were guilty of in killing the Lord of glory; not as preparation to baptiſme, but repentance and baptiſme are both exhorted unto as precedent to the gift of the Holy Ghoſt; whereas if ſuch preparation had been needfull to baptiſme, Peter ſhould have ſtayed for the gift of the Holy Ghoſt to manifeſt their fitneſſe, or at leaſt given them ſome directions by which they might manifeſt their fitneſſe, or ſhew their repentance and faith, which he never did. St. Luke doth indeed ſay, They that gladly received the word were baptized; but that they manifeſted it any way but by receiving baptiſme gladly doth not appeare; and this was ground enough for an Hiſtorian to ſay they gladly received the word, wherein they were exhorted to be baptized when they were gladly baptized.

As for that ſtory of Cornelius that was indeed a pure Gentile. Though Peter had commiſſion enough to have gone to him by the command of Chriſt, Mat. 28. 19. and to have baptized him and taught him the commands of Chriſt, yet it is plaine Peter did not underſtand the Commiſſion, therefore God for Peters owne ſatisfaction, and the ſatisfaction of them of the circumciſion, was pleaſed in all that ſtory to goe before Peter in a miraculous way; Peter was ſo farre from baptizing of Cornelius, that he was hardly perſwaded to goe to him or preach to him, but as God did go before him by miracles, which when they of the circumciſion ſaw, the text ſaith, they were aſtoniſhed: And of this very ſtory St. Peter, Act. 15. and other places maketh uſe of to ſatisfie the Jewes touching the calling of the Gentiles: but this was the mercy of God during the infancie of the Church to uſe ſuch extraordinary meanes for the drawing off the Jewes from that ceremoniall diſtinction that God himſelfe had put between Jewes and Gentiles, but in the orderly adminiſtration God ſent the Holy Ghoſt, though by extraordinary manifeſtations, yet in a ſeaſonable time when firſt he had tendered the meanes of grace: As for the falling of the Holy Choſt upon the Apoſtles in cloven tongues, Act. 2. that came ſeaſonably upon them when they had occaſion to uſe them, and after had been baptized; but the Holy Ghoſt promiſed in v. 28. is promiſed after Peter had preached repentance and baptiſme; nay on many after they were baptized, Repent and be baptized, and ye ſhall receive the holy Ghoſt: ſhewing that preaching and baptizing are but the tenders of grace, neither the one nor the other of any force unleſſe the Holy Ghoſt come. Now though the manner of the giving the Holy Ghoſt be different, yet the ſeaſon is according to the way of Gods diſpenſation, God will have outward means firſt tendered, and after he will bleſſe it where he pleaſeth, among which outwatd meanes theſe are chiefe, if not all can

or

or ought to be used by way of tender baptisme, and teaching, which is all that is tendred in the commission, whatsoever is is babbled to the contrary: baptising is set before teaching the commands of Christ, as I have formerly manifested; and indeed, it were a strange thing for the sacrament of baptisme to be tendered to men that were already clean, and approved, declared and manifested to be clean; it is true, it may be tendered to men that professe their faith, because men cannot judge them faithfull, notwithstanding any profession, and therefore baptise them; but if they could know and judge them faithfull, they might give them the Lords supper, in which all Christ is communicated, and baptisme should not be needfull; baptisme is the seal of the tender of Christ, and of the purging power of his blood, not of our communion or partaking of Christ, that is sealed in the other sacrament.

Now to come to the signification, it is preparative to all other graces, it signifieth regeneration; and therefore it is called regeneration, *John* 3. 5. Except ye be regenerate by water and the Spirit, ye cannot enter into the kingdome of heaven. Now, certainly the Holy Ghost would not set forth the grace of baptisme by regeneration, or newbirth, if any grace had been preparative to it, it is not possible that any life or motion should be imagined before regeneration; it is true, in *John* 3. 5. Except ye be born by water and the Spirit, unlesse ye be of water and the Spirit; that which we translate born, is γεννηθῇ, *be*, and *Tit.* 3. 5. Baptisme is called λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας, the laver of regeneration. Lest men may vulgarly imagine, that men are spiritually begotten by the Word, and were to remain some time in their mothers belly, the church, before they were brought forth by baptisme: during which time, they were to be catechumens, and made fit to be received into the Church: that word which is translated born, *John* 3. in 1 Cor. 4. 15. is translated begotten, I have begotten you through the Gospel: For there it is ἐγέννησα. and indeed, there can be no imagination of life before there is a being, before begetting; it is true, *adultus* must have faith, such as it is, naturall, humane: before he can be baptized, he must be willing by some inclination or other: it were barbarous to baptize a grown man against his will, which could not be gotten but by some kinde of credence, though it might be just with men to punish him with death that should refuse, as it is with God to punish with eternall death, such as despise baptisme; yet that Ministers should refuse to baptise any man that shall desire baptisme, untill he hath saving faith, is to require actions of life, and reason from a man before he were begotten, or cleanesse and purity before he were washed. Again, that sacrament that was administred unto all the churches of the Gentiles in the Scripture mentioned, without any mention in the Scripture, of any preparative grace that must it self be the symbol of the first grace, and preparative of all other graces: But baptisme is such, therefore baptisme is preparative to all other graces. Let all the Epistles of the Apostles be searched

and ye ſhall finde they were all written to baptized perſons, that they are full of exhortations to faith, and ſometimes arguments drawn from baptiſme paſt, to move them to repentance and newneſſe of life, *Rom.*6. 4. St. Paul doth indeed tell them that they were buried by baptiſm with Chriſt, but what doth he collect out of that? therefore repent and believe, but doth he at any time, ſpeaking of faith, and repentance, argue from thence to baptiſme, and tell any of them, if they would believe and repent, they ſhould be baptized? which the right method of handling the doctrine of the Goſpel would have required, if faith and repentance had been preparatives; but I am confident, if any man ſhall take on him to teach faith, and repentance, as preparatives to baptiſme, he muſt either make his Text, or draw that out of it that will not come: he that will teach any doctrine other then ſo much as may make them willing to be baptized, and repute them diſciples, and teach them as diſciples of Chriſt unbaptized, muſt follow no Apoſtolicall Precept or Example. That which is drawn out of the commiſsion, is without ground, that teaching muſt go before baptizing, becauſe μαθητεύσατε, is ſet firſt: For, firſt the phraſe of the words is changed, μαθητεύσατε βαπτίζοντες, whereas had there been a methodicall enumeration of things that ought to have been performed in order one before another, the ſtile ought not to have been altered; it ſhould have been, μαθητεύσατε καὶ βαπτίσατε, Go, teach and baptize; and therefore thoſe that would gather any thing out of the order of the words, muſt be enforced to read them ſo, which the Text will not permit. Again, the word μαθητεύσατε is an *Aoriſt.* in the Imperative mood, which ſtandeth for a Future, whereas the words, baptizing and teaching what I command, are both Preſent. Again, this μαθητεύσατε, ye ſhall make diſciples, is the end, and ought to be the firſt ſet down, and declared to thoſe that ſhall be imployed about the means, as I have formerly proved, and ſo the ſtile doth clearely manifeſt, ye ſhall make all the world diſciples, baptizing them, and teaching them whatſoever I command, which is as much as by ſo doing, ye ſhall make them diſciples: as if a man ſhould ſay ſowing in ſeaſon, and making good choice of your ſeed and land, ye ſhall have a good crop; here is plainly intended, that theſe Participiall expreſsions, this ſowing and making good choice ſhall be taken up for the mean, and the crop is to be expected after, as the ſucceſſe and event of them: as for μαθητεύω, from μανθάνω, to learn, and therefore ſome collect, that it doth imply a learning with profit, that is nothing to the preparation; if there be any thing in that, it is in the ſucceſſe, and it hath the vertue of a promiſe, and is eſtimated by God, limited and extended according to the good pleaſure of God, *Iſai.*48.17. I am the Lord thy God, that teacheth thee to profit: Paul plants, Apollo watereth, it is God that giveth the ſucceſſe; and if it ſhould ſtand in that ſenſe as a preparation to baptiſme in the commiſsion, it muſt contain a manifeſt falſhood, or prove undeniably univerſall grace, if they ſhall teach with profit all nations, and baptize them; or at leaſt, an univerſall nationall acceptation

of the Goſpell, teaching with profit can admit of no milder ſenſe then that; and if every perſon muſt be taught with profit before he be baptized, then none ought to be baptized but the elect of God; and it were a ſin for any Miniſter to baptize any other but ſuch as received profit by the word, the word worketh to the hurt of the reprobate whatſoever ſhew of profit it may ſeem to have.

3. Reaſon, That doctrine that taketh away the diſtinction of the two Sacraments, that is a falſe doctrine; but Anabaptiſme doth take away the diſtinction of the two Sacraments, *ergo*, the doctrine of the Anabaptiſts is a falſe doctrine. That doctrine that requireth preparation to both Sacraments, taketh away the difference of the Sacraments; but Anabaptiſts require preparation to both Sacraments, therefore Anabaptiſts take away the difference of the Sacraments.

The difference doth conſiſt in this, that the Sacrament of baptiſme is preparative to the Lords Supper, ſacramentally giving that to us which we ſtand in need of, to make us fit for the Lords Supper: I ſay, ſacramentally, not that God cannot or doth not take his owne time of calling ſometime before we are partaker of either Sacrament, ſometimes after we have both Sacraments; yea and after we have ſinfully prophaned the Lords Supper: but Sacraments have their proper uſe and ſignification, and are as all other duties lyable to abuſe. Wee muſt behave our ſelves as men under the meanes: we have our duties charged upon us of God, whereof ſome are officiall, ſome perſonall belonging to every mans perſon, about the performance of all which, we may ſinne either by omiſſion or miſuſe; but all the good that we receive by word or ſacraments is of God: what we doe by way of office that lyeth charged on us by the rule that we receive from God, which is to baptize all Nations and teach them; the ſucceſſe is of God, and the account of faith muſt be given to God; we can take ſome account of ſome workes, to wit, thoſe that are externall; but of faith and of ſuch workes as are immanent the thoughts of the heart, we can ſay nothing to them. Now the communion that is between Chriſt and us, is ſet downe in Scripture by Chriſts being or dwelling in us, and we in him; we muſt firſt be in Chriſt before he can be in us: we were in Chriſt by election before the foundation of the world, and therefore may be received into Chriſt before we can have faith; nay we are ſaid to be baptized into Chriſt, Rom. 6. 3. ſo many of you are baptized into Chriſt Jeſus, and the grace of baptiſme is ſaid to be wrought by the Spirit, by the Spirit ye are baptized into one body, 1 Cor. 12, 13. and Gal. 3. 27. As many as are baptized into Chriſt have put on Chriſt: Chriſt is never ſaid to be conveyed into us by baptiſme, but by faith. Epheſ. 3. 17. That Chriſt may dwell in your hearts by faith: what is inſtrumentally ours by faith, is ſacramentally ours by the Lords ſupper: he therefore that eateth Chriſt in the Lords ſupper, Chriſt is in him. John. 6. 56. He that eateth my fleſh dwelleth in me, and I in him: but Chriſt is never ſaid to be in us by baptiſme, but we are baptiſed into Chriſt; he is not baptized into us, but he is communicated

municated into us in the Lords ſupper, for which faith is required as a preparation, and the habitation of Chriſt in us is aſcribed to faith as a meanes as before, that Chriſt may dwell in your hearts by faith; but our birth in Chriſt, or regeneration is not at all aſcribed to faith, but to the Spirit and water, *John* 3. 5. Except a man be born by water and the Spirit: and to the Word, 1 *Cor.* 4. 15. I have begotten you through the Word, but never are we ſaid, either to be born or begotten by faith: the acts of faith, are growth, life, and fruits of ſanctification, *Joh.* 6. 35. Thoſe that believe and come to Chriſt, are ſaid to eat and drink Chriſt: For, he that cometh unto Chriſt, is promiſed he ſhall never hunger; and he that believeth in him, ſhall never thirſt. And this vertue is aſcribed to the body and blood of Chriſt, from whence Divines do juſtly gather, that he that believeth, doth eat the fleſh, and drink the blood of Chriſt, but no intimation in Scripture from whence any man can collect, that he that believeth is baptized, unleſſe it be *a poſteriori*: For, he that doth believe, muſt firſt be baptized by the Spirit, before he can believe; and thus are the graces offered in the ſacraments, kept diſtinct, which otherwiſe would be the ſame: that the grace of baptiſme is initiall, that of the Lords ſupper is perfective, which may further be manifeſted thus; our calling hath two parts, the proffer of grace, and the acceptance of grace proffered: The firſt is by the Word, the Spirit, and Baptiſme; the other is by the Word, Spirit, Faith, and the Lords ſupper. I have here added faith, becauſe the Scripture doth ſo, making faith an inſtrument by which we receive Chriſt: but Chriſt muſt be proffered to us by his Spirit and Word, before we can receive him, which is expreſſed in the word calling, as diſtinct from juſtification, and goeth before juſtification, in which we have the firſt act of faith, *Rom.* 8. 30. Whom he predeſtinateth, them he alſo called, whom he called, them he alſo juſtified; we are not called by faith, but we are juſtified by faith, *Rom.* 2. 28. and 5. 1. Baptiſme is the ſeal and ſacrament of Gods work in us, which had need to be moſt cleerly manifeſted, and confirmed unto us, as having moſt of God, and leaſt of us, that we might ſubmit to it, whereunto we are moſt averſe; therefore what hath moſt of us in it, that pleaſeth us beſt: as works better then faith, and faith, as we look on it in our ſelves, as a qualification is more delightfull to us then as it is in its own nature, working humiliation, teaching us to deny our ſelves, and reſt on God: men do uſe to maguifie faith, but too many under a falſe apprehenſion, even of ſecrecie and liberty before men; faith is not a boaſting quality, nor to be pleaded before men, but God; and this St. James, *cap.* 2. doth handle at large, ſhewing, that men are very inclinable to talk and boaſt of faith before men, and rely on works before God; and herein the deceitfulneſſe of our hearts is very great, when we conceive we deal with an heart-knower, then we finde the things of faith apprehended moſt weakly of any thing; we can pleaſe our ſelves better in the opinion of our works then of faith, but when we come to deal with man, we are ſure we treat of colours before blind

men: there we can boldly talk, we may ſpeak as freely as travellers, we cannot be diſproved, whereby it cometh to paſſe, often times, that heart that is leaſt upright, is moſt bold; faith is indeed, in time of need, very heroick in her exploits, in that ſhe acteth by the power of God, but aſcribeth little of her beſt actions to her ſelf: ſhe is alwayes converſant with God, and therefore cannot but be conſcious of much weakneſſe and infirmity; faith is ſo always loaden with difficulties, that ſhe hath very little to ſay of her ſelf; there muſt be great preparation on Gods part, before there can be any ſenſe or feeling in man of the things of faith; there muſt be the mighty operation of the Word and Spirit, and God is pleaſed to adde baptiſm too, for faith to work upon: theſe things are of mighty operation, and ſo they had need, conſidering the ſloth of heart that is in us to believe: it is well, if after the Word and ſacrament of baptiſme, faith do come. God layeth it as a ground and foundation for faith to work upon, and accordingly all the arguments of Scripture are to raiſe us to walk worthy of amendment of life, and to riſe with Chriſt, *Rom.* 6. as if it ſhould be ſaid, God hath offered you grace in baptiſme, therefore accept of it; ye are born anew in baptiſme, let it appear in your converſation.

Argum. 4. That which maketh the admiſſion into the Church meerly arbitrary, that is a falſe doctrine; but the doctrine of Anabaptiſts maketh admiſſion into the Church meerly arbitrary, *Ergo*, the major is plain; for, that nothing is more directly contrary to the ſervice of God then will-worſhip, but denying any that are tendred according to the mind of Chriſt in the Word, and requiring ſuch diſpoſition in the party to be baptized, as the Miniſter pleaſeth, without any rule from Gods Word, is to make the publike ſervice of God, or at leaſt a great part of it, wholly arbytrary; and this doth appear to flow from their doctrine: not yet any man durſt affirm what was the meaſure of faith to be required how much he muſt believe that muſt be baptized, by means whereof the whole matter dependeth on the will of the Baptizer, a thing moſt contrary to the nature of Religion; it cannot be imagined that the Holy Ghoſt would have been ſo ſilent in giving rules for the Miniſters to walk by in the triall of the faith of the perſon to be baptized, if any ſuch charge had lain upon his office. He muſt baptize believers only, ſaith Mr. Tombes, and the Anabaptiſts, but no Scripture directeth what, or how much he muſt believe; muſt it be as much as the Miniſter ſhall think fit, then ſome Miniſters will baptize with very ſmall triall, others will be very hardly ſatisfied: ſome will baptize as ſoon as the childe can be taught to ſay he believeth in Chriſt, others not till ten or twelve, others twenty yeers of age; wherein no man can either ſatisfie his own conſcience, or any reaſonable man; for that he walketh without rules, neither doth this difficulty from this doctrine come from accidental miſconſtructions or phanſies, but inevitable neceſſity from the doctrine it ſelf, that the Miniſter muſt baptize none but believers; yet cannot tell how much, or what he muſt believe before he be fit for baptiſme, unleſſe he walk by rules of mans making, without any intimation from Scripture.

5. That

5. That doctrine that giveth man that power which is divine, that doctrine is blaſphemous and falſe; but the doctrine of the Anabaptiſts giveth man that power which is divine, therefore the doctrine of Anabaptiſts is blaſphemous and falſe.

That doctrine that giveth man power to judge of faith in another, that doctrine giveth man that power that is divine; but the Anabaptiſt giveth men power to judge of faith in another; therefore the Anabaptiſt, that power that is divine.

Faith is in the heart: with the heart man beleeveth to righteouſneſſe, and with the mouth he confeſſeth to ſalvation, Rom. 10. 10. He therefore that judgeth of faith, muſt judge the heart which is proper to God. I the Lord try the heart, Jer. 17. 10. Neither will it ſerve his turne to ſay, that he judgeth by rules of charity if this charge lay upon his office; to judge charitably it is one thing, another to judge *ex officio*; for the judgement of charity can never pronounce the perſon ſo judged to be ſuch as he is judged by charity to be: judgements of charity are not alwaies true, if it be poſſible we have warrant enough to judge it ſo by charity: if children may poſſibly be ſuch as the Kingdome of heaven doe belong too, wee may in charity judge them ſuch: but if we are tyed by our office to baptize none but beleevers, it will not ſerve turne to ſay we judge them ſuch by charity, to prove that we muſt baptize none but ſuch as are beleevers, ſeeing we may by charity judge many beleevers which yet are not beleevers: againe judgement of faith is denied to belong to the Apoſtles themſelves, not that we have dominion of your faith, 2 Cor. 1. 24. If God had appointed Miniſters to have judged of mens faith before they had baptized them, he would have given them ſome rules by which they ſhould have been able to walke, which he hath not done; he hath annexed baptiſme to the Miniſters calling to let men know that the grace of baptiſme commeth immediatly from Chriſt; therefore he ſent the ſeale of it by that calling that came immediately from him, but hath promiſed thoſe officers of his no ſpeciall qualifications whereby they ſhall have abilities to diſcern the faith of men more then other men have; the judgement of charity, is not a Miniſteriall qualification that belongeth to every man, and is no Miniſteriall qualification.

6. That doctrine that denieth the interpretation of the promiſe made to Abraham which S. Paul maketh that is a falſe doctrine; but the doctrine of Anabaptiſts denieth the interpretation of the promiſe made to Abraham wch St. Paul maketh: therfore the doctrine of the Anabaptiſts is falſe. Thoſe that deny the bleſſing of Abraham, and in him of all the Nations of the earth to be the Goſpel preached to Abraham in reference to the Gentiles after their call, deny the interpretation that S. Paul maketh of the promiſe made to Abraham: but the Anabaptiſts deny the bleſſing of Abraham, and in him of all the Nations of the earth, to be the Goſpell preached to Abraham in reference to the Gentiles after their call; therefore the Anabaptiſts deny the interpretation made to Abraham which S. Paul maketh; the words of S. Paul

are plain, Gal. 3. 8. the Scripture foreseeing that God would justifie the heathen through faith, preached before the Gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all Nations be blessed; where ye see plainly S. Paul affirmeth the promise to Abraham to be the Gospel, and the Nations to be converted Gentiles, and that in the promise made to Abraham, there was a Prophesie of the conversion of the Gentiles; and the Gentiles under the Gospell had Abrahams blessing, that is a blessing to them and their seed, as Abraham had to him and his seed: so that it is apparent that they which deny the blessing to the seed of the Gentiles, the blessing of the promise, deny Abrahams blessing to the Gentiles; which is directly to deny the interpretation of St. Paul concerning Abrahams blessing, and to deny that the blessing to Abraham was the Gospell, or that the promise was a Prophesie of the conversion of the Gentiles under the Gospell; all which things are plainly affirmed by S. Paul.

7. That doctrine that denieth the benefit or grace of circumcision to be offered in baptisme, that doctrine is false: but the doctrine of Anabaptists is a doctrine that denieth the benefit and grace of circumcision to be offered in baptisme, therefore the doctrine of the Anabaptists is false. That doctrine which denieth what St. Paul affirmeth, is a false doctrine: but that doctrine that denieth the benefit or grace of circumcision to be offered in baptisme, that doctrine denieth what St. Paul affirmeth; therefore that doctrine denieth the benefit and grace of circumcision to be offered in baptisme, is a false doctrine.

The place wherein St. Paul doth affirme that we have the benefit of circumcision by baptisme, is Colloss. 2. 11, 12. Let the argument be weighed, I have spoken to it in my answer to Mr. Tombes. In the which verse St. Paul affirmeth they were circumcised, that was not literally true; therefore he affirmeth in a figurative or metonymicall sense, *signi pro signato*, the thing signified by circumcision: and he further sheweth, how the benefit they were partakers of had resemblance with circumcision; circumcision did cut off the body by a synecdoche, part for the whole, but they put off the whole body, but it was the body of sin. Now this is done by the circumcision of Christ; it was this circumcision of Christ that made the circumcision of our fathers of any vertue: this had been as true of the Patriarches, that they were circumcised in putting off the body of the sinnes of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; whereof their legall circumcision was but a type, and Christs circumcision did put an end to that circumcision; yet the Colossians were circumcised in Christ: how could that be? the text plainly saith, they put off the body of the sinnes of the flesh, and that was their circumcision in the circumcision of Christ; it was the benefit of circumcision to the Jewes, which they had though they wanted the ceremony. Now all this benefit commeth unto you by being in Christ, get but into Christ and all is done; to put off the body is to dye; Christ dyed, if ye be in him, all that he did you did; he was circumcised, ye

are circumciſed; he died, ye die; if in him; thus were your fathers in Chriſt by circumciſion: ſo are ye in Chriſt by baptiſme, buried with him in baptiſme: nothing can be plainer then the grace and benefit of circumciſion was offered to the Coloſſians in baptiſme.

That doctrine that refuſeth to hear and obey the rationall and manly phraſe of the doctrine of the Goſpell, and reduce all to the ſenſitive and childiſh delivery of the Law, that is an unfaithfull and diſobedient doctrine; but the doctrine of Anabaptiſts refuſeth to heare and obey the rationall and manly phraſe of the doctrine of the Goſpell, and reduce all to the ſenſitive and childiſh delivery of the Law, therefore the doctrine of the Anabaptiſts is an unfaithfull and diſobedient doctrine; God was pleaſed to deliver the ſervice, which conſiſted in ceremonies and outward performances in ſuch manner, that every externall was directed to them the length, heighth of their Temple, and of every thing that was contined therein, to ſhew that God would be the author of all things in his worſhip: The colour, length of the curtains, of their altars, and every carved thing, were directed immediatly by God; the place where the Temple ſhould ſtand: If we ſhould rigorouſly look for particular rules in this kinde, as thoſe Anabaptiſts do in point of baptiſme look for the like direction for adminiſtration of baptiſme, as of circumciſion; and for want thereof, to neglect what the Holy Ghoſt hath ſaid concerning the nature of baptiſme, and giving direction to have it adminiſtred to all nations, thereby leaving the precept or duty of baptiſme without any lawfull uſe, for want of ſuch ſenſitive and particular direction as they had under the Law, we might be condemned for will-worſhip, for building Churches without a pattern and direction from God, how high, or how long they ſhould be, together with many things of the like nature; refuſe to pray publickly or meet to ſerve God becauſe he had appointed no place: the truth is, what they ſay againſt baptizing of Infants doth conclude againſt any baptizing at all: For, if the particular aſſignation of the perſons to be baptized muſt be diſtinguiſhed by any qualification, for want of any ſuch direction, we ſhall be enforced to leave all unbaptized: Baptize all nations, ſaith Chriſt, and *Acts* 2. 41. three thouſand ſouls were added: *Act.* 8. 12. men and women; theſe may comprehend all, male and female, without neceſſary inference, that they were grown men and women.

Now, if we leave this ſenſitive and childiſh way, and walk by the reaſonable ſenſe of Scripture, how cleerly doth the Scripture give ſatisfaction in this point, I pray you obſerve? Firſt, Chriſt doth command to baptize all nations: Secondly, he telleth, that the promiſe belonging to any, doth entitle him to baptiſme, *Acts* 2. 39. Thirdly, that the promiſe is the ſame to Abraham, and the Goſpel preached to the Gentiles, *Gal.* 3. 8. that the promiſe was to Abraham and his ſeed; that baptiſme doth circumciſe us by ingrafting us into Chriſt, *Col.* 2. 11, 12.

By

By what rational excuſes can we excuſe our ſelves for diſobediences to the
mands of Chriſt, commanding us to baptize all nations, if we refuſe any,
by a nationall covenant are brought unto us?

8 That doctrine, which under pretence of walking by Scripture, ſuppo
their doctrine by falacies, and falſe arguments, that doctrine is erroneous
falſe; but the doctrine of Anabaptiſts is ſuch, I do challenge all the Anab
and in particular Mr. Tombes, to produce any argument againſt Infants bap
from Scripture, or ſound reaſon, that ſhall reaſonably conclude from the w
without any addition or ſubſtraction, or may agree with the ſenſe and argu
of the words produced, then I ſhall account Mr. Tombes his ſcepticiſm
tolerable; in the mean time, I wiſh he might receive ſatisfaction, and ſpend
time in confirmation of his weaker brethern.

FINIS.